

Col. Robert B. Solomon, **xxx-xx-xxxx** Army of the United States (lieutenant colonel, U.S. Army).

IN THE NAVY

The following-named officers of the Navy for permanent promotion to the grade of rear admiral:

LINE

James W. Montgomery
John A. Walsh
Lee W. Fisher
Thomas J. Hughes, Jr.
Earl B. Fowler, Jr.
Frederick F. Palmer
Kent J. Carroll
William D. Roberston, Jr.
Claude P. Ekas, Jr.
Norman K. Green
Robert B. McClinton

Albert J. Monger
Murray C. Cook
John H. Alvis
John C. Dixon, Jr.
Donald P. Hall
James B. Linder
Lucien Capone, Jr.
Richard E. Nicholson
Arthur K. Knoizen
Roy D. Synder Jr.
Paul H. Speer
Sylvester R. Foley, Jr.
William P. Lawrence
Edward W. Carter III
Gerald E. Thomas
Bobby R. Inman
Hugh A. Benton
Steven A. White
Robert W. Chewning
"M" Staser Holcomb

SUPPLY CORPS

Leroy E. Hopkins
Ralph F. Murphy, Jr.
Edward M. Kocher

CHAPLAIN CORPS

Withers M. Moore
Real Adm. Patrick "J" Hannifin, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5321, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named officer of the Marine Corps Reserve for temporary appointment to the grade of brigadier general.
Robert S. Raisch.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

1976 CONGRESSIONAL SCHOLARS

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend formal recognition to a group of high school seniors participating in the Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce congressional scholarship program, now in its fifth consecutive year. In sponsoring this program, Congressman DON CLANCY and I are undertaking to provide indepth insight into the functioning of our Federal Government to those who will undoubtedly be among the leaders of their generation. The 67 students participating faced stiff competition in order to qualify for this program and deserve to be proud of their achievement.

For the next 3 days they will meet with an impressive array of persons representing each of the three branches of our Federal Government. Not only the leadership of the House of Representatives, but also representatives of the freshman class will give the students their perspective on the role and functioning of the Congress. The students will be able to question their Senators at some length. Ron Nessen will explain to them the responsibilities of the White House Press Office. A fellow Cincinnati, Justice Potter Stewart, will reflect on the crucial function of the judiciary in our democracy. In addition, these young people will examine the process by which private interests are represented in the legislative process and will be treated to the perspective of humorist Art Buchwald.

It is my strong hope that this experience will not only spur a few of these young people to someday serve in our Government, but also imbue them all with a real understanding and appreciation of its role in our society. I am pleased at this time to recognize those who were chosen to participate in the congressional scholarship program and the schools they represent. They are as follows:

Ms. Tracy Flowers, Aiken.
Mr. Tim Okel, Aiken.
Ms. Claire Aikin, Anderson.
Ms. Sue Azadian, Anderson.

Mr. Robert Kaiser, Anderson.
Mr. Bob Harris, Anderson.
Mr. Ron Gieseke, Colerain.
Ms. Kathryn Frommer, Colerain.
Mr. Daniel Wile, Cincinnati Country Day.
Ms. Michelle O'Conner, Deer Park.
Ms. Linda Haas, Diamond Oaks.
Mr. David Eby, Elder.
Mr. Robert Schehl, Elder.
Mr. Steve Wright, Finneytown.
Ms. Sally Bedford, Forest Park.
Ms. Lisa Hancock, Forest Park.
Mr. Dave Ulmer, Green Hills.
Mr. Alfred Beasley, Hughes.
Ms. Kathy Coleman, Hughes.
Ms. Camille Leugers, Indian Hill.
Mr. Jim Redmond, LaSalle.
Ms. Amy Wojcik, Live Oaks.
Mr. Brice Askren, Lockland.
Ms. Barbara Cherry, Mariemont.
Mr. Terry Gunter, Mariemont.
Ms. Mary Pat Klotz, Marian.
Ms. Katherine Juemmel, McAuley.
Ms. Dora Newman, McNicholas.
Ms. Fori Fette, McNicholas.
Ms. Cindy Cox, Norwood.
Mr. F. J. Brosnan, Moeller.
Ms. Mary Ulmschneider, Mother of Mercy.
Ms. Patricia Baas, Mt. Healthy.
Mr. Greg Greer, Mt. Healthy.
Ms. Elaine Veid, Mt. Notre Dame.
Ms. Christine Bruch, Northwest.
Ms. Christine Zimmer, North College Hill.
Mr. Thomas Huth, Oak Hills.
Ms. Sharon Luebbers, Oak Hills.
Mr. Brian Mitchell, Madeira.
Ms. Amy Brigham, Madeira.
Mr. Herschel Smith, St. Bernard.
Ms. Shirley Echoles, Our Lady of Angels.
Mr. Virgil Lovitt, Princeton.
Ms. Cheryl Ann Hedges, Princeton.
Ms. Peggy O'Donnell, Regina.
Mr. Dan Hoffman, Roger Bacon.
Ms. Laura Reyring, St. Ursula.
Mr. John Wessling, St. Xavier.
Mr. Ronnie McKinney, Scarlet Oaks.
Ms. Susan Pfeifferberger, Seton.
Ms. Christina Krohn, Summit Country Day.
Mr. George Junker, Summit Country Day.
Ms. Sue Welsh, Sycamore.
Mr. James Wise, Taft.
Mr. Ronald Morris, Taft.
Ms. Nancy Korb, Taylor.
Ms. Linda Kessel, Walnut Hills.
Mr. Ed Robinson, Walnut Hills.
Mr. Raymond Wilke, Western Hills.
Mr. James Essell, Western Hills.
Ms. Amy Schlarman, Wm. Henry Harrison.
Ms. Glenda Shaw, Withrow.
Mr. Russell Huekler, Withrow.
Mr. Lawrence Foster, Woodward.
Mr. Stephen Hacken, Woodward.
Mr. Richard Uhle, Wyoming.
Chaperones: Mr. Mark Pace, Mr. Dixon Edwards, Mr. Steve Baker, Ms. Rosemary Burke.

ALCOHOLISM AND ADVERTISING

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw Members' attention, especially those serving on the Ways and Means Committee, to an issue which should be of concern to all of us. The issue is alcoholism and the toll it takes on our society in various ways—traffic deaths, broken homes, shattered personal lives, et cetera. We all recognize these adverse effects of alcoholism. What we do not clearly recognize is the relationship between alcohol use and advertising of alcoholic beverages. We do know that the industry spends hundreds of millions of dollars to promote alcohol consumption. We do know that the costs to society of alcoholism are staggering. We can reasonably infer that advertising increases use, consistent with the ethic that guides our consumption oriented society.

In an attempt to provide a modest solution to this problem, I have been joined by over 70 Members of this House in introducing legislation to disallow alcoholic beverage advertising as a business tax deduction. I would like to quickly point out that our bill would not restrict the right of the industry to advertise its product, but would simply take the Federal Government out of the business of providing an incentive, through the tax structure, for such advertising. It is about time that we consider the social costs to our society before routinely providing tax incentives for every kind of business activity, regardless of its impact on the human environment.

State Senator William Plymat of Iowa has been deeply involved in this area for many years, and has made important contributions to our understanding of this issue. Just last week, Senator Plymat testified before the Senate Subcommittee on Alcoholism and Narcotics of the Labor and Public Welfare Committee on precisely this issue. Because I believe this to be a matter of public concern and importance, I would like to insert Senator Plymat's thoughtful testimony in the

RECORD at this point. I commend it to my colleagues.

The article follows:

STATEMENT OF STATE SENATOR WILLIAM N. PLYMAT

I passed up today's session of the Iowa State Senate and came here to speak to your committee because I am convinced that the alcoholic beverage trade of this country, through its advertising practices, is pursuing a policy that is calculated to increase alcoholism in this country, and that there is something that the Congress of the United States can do about it. And I believe your Committee can take some leadership action in this direction.

THE MOST POTENT AREA OF ADVERTISING

It is one thing for the alcoholic beverage trade to remind people to buy liquor, to stress individual brands to portray their bottles in multicolored, attractive advertisements. While I am not happy about this type of advertising, the worst that can be said about it is that it keeps nagging those on the road down into alcoholism to buy some more liquor. But the really disturbing advertising, and the most potent in its long-run bad results, so far as alcoholism in this country is concerned, is that which induces youth to start drinking at an early age. I am speaking about the advertising that suggests that a single girl should be drinking scotch—that suggests that a young person cannot have a successful social relationship with a person of the other sex without alcohol—that hints that for success in sexual relationships, alcohol is the device that should be used. That such advertising often leads to unwanted pregnancies is well known, since persons under the influence of alcohol are certainly often careless in their sexual relationships, but far worse is the fact that young people are being led into addiction to alcohol in large numbers. I have brought with me some of the advertisements that I am complaining about and will show them to you at the end of my remarks.

WHY THE SPECIAL CONCERN ABOUT YOUTH?

While admittedly alcohol produces a pleasant euphoria and sedation for many people, it produces intoxication for all who use it in sizable amounts and leads to the deaths of around half the people killed in traffic accidents in this country. But in the case of about one out of twelve of our people, it produces an addiction which is devastating in multitudes of serious ways in the lives of millions and, unless arrested, in most cases results in death.

There is no common agreement why the small minority become addicted and the majority do not. There is no test that can be given to a young person to tell him or her whether, if he uses alcohol, he will become hooked on it in a similar way that youths become hooked on such hard drugs as heroin. I have often heard that around 6 percent of the people consume 50 percent of the liquor, beer and wine in this country. I believe we are dealing primarily with a drug addiction. And I fear that the alcoholic beverage trade knows all too well who their most important customers are—it's the heavy drinkers.

It is clear to me that if the alcoholic beverage industry is able, through heavy advertising that runs in the hundreds of millions of dollars, to induce a million young people to start drinking, that sooner or later, around 80,000 of these youth will wind up with a severe alcohol problem that will be described by the terms alcoholism or, at least, severe problem drinking. Now, if the advertising of this industry was respectful of this danger to youth, their ads would be limited to those I first described. But they are not content with that—they direct large amounts of their advertising to youth. And they are successful. Pick up a copy of *Playboy*, *Playgirl*, *Oui*, *Penthouse*, and the multi-

tude of other such publications aimed at our young people.

THE MYTH THAT ALCOHOL ADVERTISING MAKES NO DIFFERENCE

There is a widely promoted idea that alcohol advertising has no effect toward alcoholism. This is based, I believe, on the contention that alcoholism is just a manifestation of either a psychosis or, more commonly, a neurosis, and that somehow advertising is impotent in inducing such alcohol use as results in addiction. The theme is that all we need to do is to somehow teach people to "drink responsibly", and that this is an achievable objective in nearly all cases. Those persons who are susceptible to addiction cannot be taught to be "responsible drinkers". Have you ever heard of any brilliant psychiatrist converting an alcoholic into a successful social drinker? For such persons, when the chips are down, it is ultimately abstinence or death.

FOR MANY, IS ALCOHOLISM A SIMPLE DRUG ADDICTION?

A couple of years ago, the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism entered into a reported million dollar contract with the Education Commission of the States to make a study on how to educate the American people to make responsible decisions about alcohol—that is, either to abstain or, if drinking, to drink "responsibly". Under this contract, former Governor John C. West of South Carolina has led a 19-person Task Force in a study, and hopefully they will come out with a fruitful report next year. I was invited to speak to their Task Force in the summer of 1974 and later to set up a special seminar of 50 persons to explore the case for the like-style of abstinence, which I did. In my initial speech to the group, I outlined the reasons, aside from neurotic and psychotic, that cause some people to become hooked on alcohol. In my 22-page written text, I outlined these other reasons in detail, and I have some copies of this talk for any who may be interested.

But for quick reference, let me cite them to you. The hypothalamus appears to be related to addiction in some, if not many. It is contended that in some, the section of the brain which controls the autonomic nervous system of the body—the non-conscious functions—is sensitive to alcohol and causes addiction. Hyperinsulinism is involved in others—the body produces an excess of insulin, rather than an inadequate amount, as in the case of diabetes. Genetic origin, hereditary and nationality factors appear relevant. There appears to be a possible hormone factor—it's contended, and I personally have observed, that there are relatively few bald-headed male alcoholics. Dr. James W. Smith, M.D., Director of the famous Schick-Shadel Hospital in Seattle, which, I believe, has the best track record of permanently sobering up alcoholics in this country, is the authority for the statement that alcoholics and non-alcoholics have many metabolic differences. Details of this are in the talk I referred to.

It is interesting to observe the fact that a large majority of alcoholics are heavy smokers—often quitting alcohol but being unable to stop smoking even when a three pack a day addiction is causing great physical damage; note also that alcoholics are most often heavy coffee drinkers. All this indicates the existence of addictive types.

Where does this take us? If, for large numbers, alcoholism is simply a drug addiction, then persons that have those susceptibilities should never drink. This takes us back to advertising. If alcoholism is, for many, a drug addiction—and advertising induces initial use, then its inducement, for those, leads to addiction.

I have heard it contended that for one to get lung cancer from smoking, he must

smoke heavily for many years and, in addition, have a personal susceptibility, the nature of which is unknown at this time. A person with a distorted sense of humor observed that if one did not know whether he had that susceptibility, he could smoke heavily for twenty years, and if he got lung cancer, he would then have the satisfaction of knowing he was susceptible. Our youth cannot know in advance whether, if they use alcohol, they have "susceptibility" and will wind up hooked on it. But we know that about one out of twelve has it. And it follows that, to the extent that alcoholic beverage advertising induces and promotes youth usage, it is a potent adverse factor in our national alcoholism problem. And this is true whether the cause be psychological or physical or a combination of the two.

Dr. George Valles, M.D., is a psychiatrist extensively involved in therapy work in alcoholism at the U.S. Veterans Hospital in Houston, Texas. He is a leading advocate of the hypothalamus theory of addiction. He said at one time: "... the younger the age at which an individual starts to ingest alcohol, the greater the chances that he will develop into a chronic alcoholic. For the action of the alcohol is channeled directly toward the adolescent's imbalanced hypothalamus and autonomic nervous system, thereby obstructing his emotional maturation on both psychological and physiological levels."

Others may blame the apparent special dangers of youth addiction to alcohol on other causes, such as the fact that youth have not developed adequate maturity, character, will power or other human traits. But the fact is that most people (society in general) seem to believe that alcohol holds special dangers for youth. Why did we for so long have a legal drinking age of 21 in this country? And although many states have lowered the legal age in one way or another to 19 and, in some cases, to 18, why is there a drive on an many states to raise the legal age? The Minnesota Legislature has just passed a bill to raise the legal age in that state from 18 to 19 and sent the bill to Governor Anderson, who is expected to sign it in a few days. In my State, 40% of the House and Senate have co-sponsored bills to raise the legal age back from 18 to 19, and the House has already passed it.

WHAT ACTION SHOULD BE TAKEN

I have talked with liquor industry officials urging them to "clean up" their advertising, but it seems to me no avail. I told them they will face legal sanctions if they do not, because society was getting fed up with the trend of alcoholic beverage advertising aimed especially at youth. This has not resulted in any constructive action that I can see.

What legislative action can be taken? There are two possibilities. One has to start in the U.S. House, since it deals with taxation—and it has. We can put an economic damper on alcoholic beverage advertising by making it a non-deductible expense item in computing net income for tax purposes. If the industry spends 500 million dollars a year in advertising and continues that expenditure, since it is mostly, if not entirely, in the 48% tax bracket, it would have to pay nearly 250 million dollars in additional income taxes, and facing that, it seems reasonable that they would cut their ad budgets. There are over 70 co-sponsors of the Brown Bill in the House, but the House Ways and Means Committee is still stalling in giving the bill even a short hearing.

The other possibility I see is to follow the example of the Province of Ontario and put in some censorship of alcoholic beverage advertising. I wish to call to your attention the Directives on Advertising and Sales Promotion of the Liquor Control Board of Ontario. Time will not permit me to discuss all of these, but let me quote just one: "Advertising shall not encourage the consumption of beverage alcohol products nor represent the consumption of beverage alcohol prod-

ucts as a factor of personal or collective merit, and especially, create the impression that the consumption of beer, wine, cider, or spirits in any way enhances or promotes a life-style or way of life such as prestige, success in business, relationships with the opposite sex, or becomes a necessary element in participating in sports, activities, improving performance in sports, or helping to solve personal problems."

In Ontario, the industry is permitted to engage in public service advertising, corporate advertising and brand or product advertising. Ads are required to be submitted to the Board for approval prior to publication. There is currently a 2 hour limitation on radio programming and a 1½ hour limitation on TV programming per station per week. In daily newspapers, there is a lineage limit per week and year.

I think Congress has the authority to take some constructive action of this kind, although I am sure that a careful study will have to be made. I believe actions of this kind can be taken in spite of possible Constitutional limitations. The police power of governments is wide and powerful.

I am sure that many would prefer to take positive action to bring the alcoholic beverage advertising into some compliance with reasonable standards rather than to attempt to attack it through the tax power, as proposed by the Brown Bill. But if we cannot, or will not, take that kind of action in an adequate way, I am hopeful that Congress will pass the Brown Bill, which, I believe, can take us a long way down the road in dampening down the alcoholic beverage advertising that I feel will give us an increasing number of young alcoholics in this country.

SOUTH BOSTON POST TO CELEBRATE 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the South Boston Post No. 6536 VFW, I would like to commemorate the 30th birthday of this VFW Post, an anniversary which will be officially recognized on Saturday, April 10, 1976.

To share with my colleagues and friends this most auspicious occasion, I would like to quote the following article, which appeared in the March 1976 edition of the Massachusetts VFW News:

On April 10, 1946 a small group of veterans, mostly World War II, but also numbering some from World War I and the various campaigns in the so-called "Banana Republic Wars" gathered in the first floor of an old "three decker" in the Andrew Square section of South Boston to form the nucleus of what was to become a proud close knit VFW unit. A few years later the Post moved to a small storefront location on Southampton street just off the Square. In 1966 due to the efforts of its members led by some of the most dedicated Veterans of Foreign Wars supporters, an abandoned laundry building on Ellery street in the rear of Andrew MTBA Station was purchased. The property was in need of much repair, large holes existed in the floor where the old laundry machinery had been removed, part of the roof was missing and the rear wall was for all practical purposes nonexistent. A massive repair program was launched with a great part of the work done by members on their own time; and in a very short time we were able to begin operations.

South Boston Post has not only been active within the Veterans of Foreign Wars, but

has taken a leading role in community affairs. In addition to a most active ladies auxiliary, the Post sponsors the cadet ship Springfield of the Junior Naval Cadets of America, Sons of the VFW, junior girls auxiliary unit, a Boy Scout troop and a Cub Scout pack. At present quarters have been made available for the training of the new Dorchester Heights militia, a unit which will play a leading part in the upcoming bicentennial observance of the Evacuation of Boston by British forces in 1776. The Post has supported the annual "Shamrock Fund" of the Allied War Veterans' Council of South Boston which was set up to assist local youngsters in furthering their education. The list of community projects supported is so long we have listed only these token few in order to stress how we are carrying out the VFW's dedication to community service.

South Boston Post has contributed much to veterans' activities as well. Several of our members have served on the state and national level among them, Past District Commanders Harold Epstein, Arnold E. McGee, Walter M. Clark, John H. Neas. The chief marshal of the annual Evacuation—St. Patrick's Day has been chosen from this Post more often than any other in the district, including this year's bicentennial chief marshal Arnold E. McGee. South Boston Post was foremost in the fight to return Veterans Day to November 11th. Our Post received much publicity and the fight on this issue in turn received public recognition, by the action of our members in voting not to fly our Post colors on this prostitution of this most important holiday. Over the years our membership has continued to grow and we look forward to a continuation of service to VFW and our home community.

ALL THREE LEADING CIVIL AIR PATROLS IN NATION COME FROM MACOMB COUNTY, MICH.

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, this evening Members of the Congress will attend a reception in the caucus room of the Cannon House Office Building to pay tribute to the Civil Air Patrols which have been selected for their outstanding achievements during 1975. I am exceedingly proud to be able to report that the top three national winners come from Macomb County, Mich., a major portion of which is in the 12th Congressional District which I am privileged to represent in the Congress of the United States.

The winning squadrons, Mr. Speaker, are the South Cacom Squadron under the command of Capt. Vern Michalke, which was rated No. 1 in the Nation; the Van Dyke Squadron under the command of Lt. Harold Van Kirk, which was rated No. 2 in the Nation; and the Selfridge Air National Guard Squadron under the command of Capt. Thomas Fellows, which was rated No. 3 in the Nation.

The winners of these national awards are judged on the basis of a number of different achievements, including the achievements of individual cadets in such areas as leadership training, aerospace education, moral leadership and physical fitness. In addition, local CAP units are graded on the basis of participation in 2-week annual encampments, the num-

ber of orientation flights which CAP members participate in, and the number of individual cadet awards for outstanding achievement in a variety of areas.

The selection process is, as I understand it, a rather long and involved one. Recommendations and nominations for these awards are made by wing and regional commanders, and the top 10 nominations go to a special selection board at CAP Headquarters at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama, which makes the final determination of the outstanding squadrons.

It is my understanding, Mr. Chairman, that this is the first time in the history of the CAP program that the top three squadrons came from the same area, and I am proud, indeed, that they are all from Macomb County, Mich.

At the reception this evening, Mr. Chairman, the three Macomb County winners will receive unit citations, and the No. 1 and No. 2 squadrons will also receive plaques. I know that the Congress will be paying its respects to these Civil Air Patrol units this evening, but I wanted to take this opportunity here in the House of Representatives to pay my own tribute to these dedicated units, which have brought such credit upon the Civil Air Patrol organization, upon Macomb County, Mich., and, of course, upon themselves.

I salute all three for a job well done.

HUMANITARIAN AWARD

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11 citizens of my hometown of Greensboro and many of their neighbors from throughout the State of North Carolina will gather to honor a distinguished friend, Benjamin Cone, Sr., as he receives the National B'nai B'rith Humanitarian Award.

Ben Cone is a man of extraordinary talents and accomplishments. He is a man of deep faith who has demonstrated his service to all mankind in countless ways.

He has been mayor of Greensboro and has served on the city council. He has been a guiding force in the development of medical services through the Moses H. Cone Hospital. His commitment to the arts has been demonstrated through his generosity, tangible and intangible, to the University of North Carolina at Greensboro and the Weatherspoon Art Gallery.

Perhaps his most rewarding service in a personal sense has been his leadership in support of the Children's Home Society of North Carolina and the Oxford Orphanage.

His life has already earned for him such recognition as the Eleanor Roosevelt Humanitarian Award of the Israel Bond Organization and the Distinguished Citizen Award of the Greensboro Chamber of Commerce.

Most important of all, Ben Cone's life and its commitment has won for him the

admiration and the respect of those who have known him, worked with him and share with him the joy of living.

All of these people join together in the sentiments expressed in the citation to be presented next month which reads:

B'NAI B'RITH YOUTH SERVICES HUMANITARIAN AWARD IN HONOR OF BENJAMIN CONE, SR.

With grateful recognition of his dedicated commitment to bettering the lives of his fellow man, his excellence of leadership, and his devoted service to his community and country.

A man of wisdom and vision, of compassion and selfless generosity, his life is truly a model for the young people of America.

With deep and abiding concern for the future of our great country and all its people, he has extended a generously helping hand to our young people through the Youth Services of B'nai B'rith.

Motivated by the spirit that made North Carolina "First in Freedom", Benjamin Cone, Sr., is a man whose commitment to his community and its citizens exemplifies the finest in both American and Jewish tradition. B'nai B'rith is proud to honor such a man.

GOVERNMENT IS THE CAUSE OF INFLATION AND THE RESULTANT RISE IN PRICES

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, an important article has come to my attention by Dr. Richard Timberlake, professor of economics and finance at the University of Georgia, who is recognized as an expert on money and inflation.

Dr. Timberlake points out that we can directly observe increases in the money prices that we pay as we go about our everyday affairs, but that we cannot directly observe increases in the supply of money except by following changes in statistical data and charts that only technical experts keep up with. Therefore, it is easy for us to misinterpret price increases as being the cause of inflation when in fact they are the result of inflation.

Dr. Timberlake reminds us that the cause of inflation is the new money pumped into the economy through the Federal Reserve System to finance the fiscal deficits of the Federal Government. Government deficit spending causes new money to be pumped into the economy at a faster rate than the production of new goods and services, so prices must rise.

When we overlook that it is too rapid expansion of the supply of money that causes inflation, we run the great risk of manufacturing nonexistent crises that lead to an increase in Federal bureaucracy, bureaucracy that has no real purpose other than self-justification. The March 9 issue of the Wall Street Journal points out that the new and supposedly temporary Federal Energy Agency has 112 press agents, 1,000 press releases and is engaged in the production of coloring books for grade school children.

By not doing our homework we in the Congress have created another bureaucratic monster that is busily devouring taxpayers' dollars at an increasing rate,

when in fact there never was an "energy crisis." Dr. Timberlake points out that the real prices of delivered fuel have gone down and a much greater quantity is being consumed. How is it a crisis to have more at a lower price? The reason we thought there was a crisis was that we mistook a rise in the money price for a rise in the real price.

Writing in February 1975, when the Consumer Price Index stood at 154, Dr. Timberlake points out that in spite of the big jump in the money price of gasoline to the consumer during the so-called gasoline shortage, the price of gasoline has gone up by less than the Consumer Price Index so that the real cost to consumers has declined.

If we update Dr. Timberlake's figures to February 1976, we see that although the price of gasoline per gallon has increased from 34 cents in 1967 to 56 cents today the Consumer Price Index has gone from 100 to 163. Therefore, the real price of gasoline to the consumer today is the same as it was in 1967. If the Congress had taken the actual facts of the matter into account, we would not have stacked another bureaucracy on the taxpayer's back, a bureaucracy whose redtape also adds to the cost of the energy industry.

It is important that consumer groups also take into account real, rather than money, price changes when protesting regulated price increases for fuel and electric power. If utilities are not allowed rate increases to match the change in the price level, their profitability is eroded and, thereby their ability to make the investment necessary to meet future energy demands is undermined.

The U.S. Congress can best help consumer advocates protect the consumer's pocketbook by exercising fiscal restraint. It is legislated deficits which become monetized that cause prices to rise.

I commend Professor Timberlake's article, which I am putting in the RECORD at this time, to my colleagues:

GOVERNMENT SPONSORED INFLATION, "REAL" PRICES

(By Dr. Richard Timberlake)

The recent spectacle of "consumerists" and "consumer groups" protesting regulated price increases for fuel electric power demonstrates again one of the principal evils of chronic inflation—the utility of money prices as measures of real value.

The problem starts with the inflation generated by the federal government. New money is pumped into the economy through the Federal Reserve System primarily to finance the exorbitant fiscal deficits that have emerged because of government spending. This new money comes into the economy at a faster rate than the production of new goods at current prices, so market prices are constantly bid up.

Several characteristics should be noted about the inflation. First, it is entirely a responsibility of the federal government's power and willingness to create money—yes, just like counterfeiters; except that the government can endow its paper money with the legal tender provision, something a counterfeiter cannot do. Private citizens share absolutely no responsibility for this condition. They are not "piggy"; they are self-interested individuals trying to avoid a tax, which reduces the value of the money they hold, by spending the money.

Second, the inflation cannot "run away" unless the government's monetary printing press runs away. This eventuality is unlikely, even for a federal government, because it

would cost the government more than it would return. People do not spend their money faster and faster during an inflation; they simply spend the greater and greater amounts that the government so graciously provides at a slightly increased rate for each dollar. It is the number of new dollars coming into existence, rather than the rate at which each dollar is spent, that makes the inflation.

Third, contrary to popular belief, the inflation is the best (or the least bad) thing that can happen once the conditions for inflation—the too-large increases in the money supply—are present. Money prices are the safety valve that led off the pressure of greater spending. For the government to try and control prices by statutory and comprehensive wage and price ceilings forces immense real costs on the economy. People, both buyers and sellers, try to evade the legal ceilings. These evasions also involve many real costs. Production is hampered, not only by the bureaucratic red tape imposed by government agencies on businesses, but also because resource allocation is significantly biased from its most efficient path.

Since 1967, the average of all money prices for commonly used goods and services has increased by 54 per cent. The Consumers Price Index based at 100 in 1967 is now at 154. Some money prices have gone up more than the average and some less. Food, for example, has gone up by about 70 per cent, while apparel has increased by only about 40 per cent.

In general, any item whose money price has gone up by less than 54 per cent has gone down in real price. As an example, consider the price of a given quality of gasoline that currently is selling at about \$.49 per gallon at the service station. In 1967, this same gasoline sold for about \$.34 per gallon. But the dollars and cents at which this item is priced have changed their "size." They are, specifically, only 65 per cent as large as they were in 1967. Therefore, the \$.49 price for gasoline today must be scaled down by 100/154 in order to compare it validly with the 1967 price. When this operation is carried out, the 1975 price turns out to be slightly less than \$.32 per gallon. Therefore, the real price of gasoline, the only valid measure of its relative value, is seen to have fallen, not risen. In addition, the economy consumes almost 50 per cent more of this product.

The foregoing is an empirically verifiable observation. It is, therefore, not political. It also suggests strongly that the "energy crisis" is a contrivance of the government by which the government's self-interest is furthered. If prices of delivered fuel have gone down and a much greater quantity is being consumed, how is that a crisis? It can only be a crisis if material increase is regarded as mortal sin.

This example, however, demonstrates how the unsuspecting general public can be led astray. People see the money prices of energy fuels increase and they treat these changes as if they were real increases—as though the value of money is remaining constant. If the value of money were constant, this view would be correct. Money price changes would be real changes.

The same kind of error is seen in the current controversy over the proposed increase in electricity rates. These rates in money terms are controlled by both state and federal regulatory agencies. Since 1967, money rates for electricity as allowed by these agencies have increased 34 per cent. Since the general price level has risen by 54 per cent, the real cost of electricity to the consuming public has declined by 13 per cent. The government regulators have forced the electric company to provide a real decline in rates which has been veiled by inflation. Surely, the well-meaning activists who are calling for public demonstrations against an increase in money rates for electricity do not intend that the electric power company

should bear all the real burdens that inflation and the government might impose upon it. If they succeed, we will have no electricity at all.

And if this same element succeeds in other critical areas, we will end up with a government wielding complete power over a stone age economy.

LAUGHING AT THE HOUSE

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in its wide-ranging investigation of the U.S. intelligence establishment, Chairman PIKE's Select Committee on Intelligence spent about \$470,000. Now Chairman FLYNN's Committee on Standards of Official Conduct is asking for very close to that amount simply to investigate the leak of the Pike report to CBS news correspondent Daniel Schorr.

A number of writers and commentators have remarked on the absurdity of this venture, but none has stated it better than syndicated columnist Mary McGrory. I am inserting two of her recent articles in the *Record* at this point for the attention of all my colleagues, and particularly those whose votes to launch this investigation have made a laughing stock of the House:

HOUSE VERSUS THE CIA: MISMATCH ALL THE WAY

(By Mary McGrory)

Looking back, you would have to agree that the Humane Society should have stepped in and stopped the match between the CIA and the House of Representatives before it ever started.

The CIA is a highly trained, intensely focused outfit, skilled in the dark arts of lies, propaganda, manipulation and dirty tricks.

The House, on the other hand, is a large, slow-witted, thin-skinned, defensive composite that wants to stay out of trouble. Its real passion is reserved for its creature comforts: salaries, recesses, office space, allowances, ever more staff to help to reach its timid decisions.

The CIA has made some poor intelligence assessments in its time, but it sized up the House just right. The CIA could tell from the way the House went about it that the House didn't really want to know what the CIA had been up to.

In the first place, it should have known all along. There is something called the "oversight committee," and the House's original impulse to put its chairman in charge of the probe told everything about its penchant for earmuffs and blinders.

In the second place, if the House found out something terrible about the CIA, people would expect it to do something—an awful prospect for people who wish to be taken seriously without ever doing anything serious if they can help it.

Finally, after months of dithering and wrangling, the House chose Rep. Otis Pike, D-N.Y., whom it certified to be one of its sharpest-eyed and sharpest-tongued members.

Pike set to work trying to find out how the CIA had been using the taxpayers' money. Every time he found out anything—and it wasn't easy—the information promptly found its way into the press.

The President scolded, Henry Kissinger

thundered. The House was uneasy. Members didn't care about the contents of the leaks—which revealed a measure of perfidy and incompetence that might have outraged the "People's house."

Pike, at length, made an agreement with the executive branch. He would make public no document vouchsafed him without the President's permission.

Director William E. Colby went on every television show except "Mary Hartman, Mary Hartman." He went to Washington parties and buttonholed Congressmen pleading for oversight and guidelines. In December, a CIA agent was murdered in Athens.

A 10-day official panoply of solemn, guilt-producing ceremonies followed: a military funeral with full honors in Arlington Cemetery, a memorial service at the CIA headquarters.

The House went into a panic. It pulled down the curtains, bolted the doors, called for the smelling salts. What had it done? Actually neither the House, nor the Senate committee which also was investigating, had revealed the name of a single agent. The House was too terrified to notice.

When Pike was ready with his report—most of it had already been published here or there—the House waved it away. It recalled Pike's promise to the President. The President had not said that the House could publish the report of wrongdoing in the executive branch. It was a matter of honor. The House voted 246-124 to bury the document, which, as a matter of fact, is now on sale in bookstores.

On Feb. 11, the *Village Voice* published its first installment of the House report. Daniel Schorr, a CBS reporter (who has since been suspended by his company) believing in the public's right to know, had provided it to the newspaper.

The House immediately knew what to do. It sat up and rang for the House Ethics Committee, a moss-covered band peopled with members of the right-thinking House Armed Services Committee. The Ethics Committee would find the villain who gave the report to Dan Schorr.

The House would be saved. The dilemma had become manageable. Sure, some CIA people had broken the law. But somebody else, some unknown, evil person, had broke the rules of the House. The House, with the wrong end of the stick, began to beat itself bloody.

The House Ethics Committee is asking for \$350,000 to find out who leaked the report that the House of Representatives had paid \$470,000 to have prepared and decided not to publish. That makes sense, doesn't it?

Everyone is laughing at the poor befuddled House. The Senate laughs out loud. The CIA is laughing up its sleeve.

The CIA has scored its greatest domestic coup. It has made the House go to war against itself, like some ignorant, underdeveloped country. Henry Kissinger said the investigation was "self-flagellation." That's exactly what it has turned out to be for the House of Representatives.

S. ADAMS LACKING IN HOUSE

(By Mary McGrory)

WASHINGTON.—In the first Congress, when a foolish notion raised its head, it was smartly put down.

A passage from a letter written by John Adams to his wife Abigail from Philadelphia on Sept. 16, 1774, illustrates how one man can deal with mindlessness.

"When the Congress first met, Mr. Cushing made a motion that it could be opened with prayer. It was opposed by Mr. Jay of N. York and Mr. Rutledge of South Carolina, because we were so divided in religious sentiments... Mr. S. Adams arose and said he was no bigot, and could hear a prayer from a gentleman

of piety and virtue who was at the same time a friend to his country."

Whereupon the members came to their senses and voted to call in a local clergyman who conducted a service that Adams reports had "an excellent effect on every body here."

It no longer the fashion in Congress to attack folly head on. It is considered bad form to do so. A lunatic course, once embarked on, must be pursued to the end—hang the expense and the reputation of the House.

The House is embarked on a costly man-hunt for the person who made it look foolish. Actually House members had already done that themselves, when they refused to read a report on the CIA prepared for them by a select committee. They suppressed the report because the President, who never wanted it written, did not wish them to make it public.

It had already been published in large measure, so their subservience nettled them nothing. But, maddened by their own incompetence, they decided to find the person who gave the report to CBS reporter Dan Schorr, who gave it to the *Village Voice*, which printed it in full.

No Mr. S. Adams was on hand to say he was no blockhead to be bullied by the Executive Department and to suppress information intended for citizens. So the Ethics Committee is asking for \$350,000 and 43 people and 1000 investigative hours to find out what a competent cop could uncover in a morning.

Originally, the enterprise was conceived as a lynching party for Dan Schorr, to make an object of those who will not subscribe to the House doctrine that what you don't know won't hurt you. But even the members of the Ethics Committee came to realize that this would bring them in conflict with a document authored by the Adamses and their ilk which contains a First Amendment guaranteeing freedom of the press.

Instead, the committee has set itself the task of finding a needle in a haystack. Some 2000 members of the Executive Department read the CIA report, as it made its rounds, crying for deletions—thanks to a witness pact between CIA Committee Chairman Otis Pike and the President. The committee will examine them all behind closed doors.

Blinding examples of how quickly and cleverly these matters can be resolved are lost on the House.

Its principal tormentor, Secretary of State Kissinger, has shown the way. Every time the leaky committee sprang another leak, the Secretary cried that the foreign policy of this country was imperiled by the loss of confidentiality.

Just last week, the Secretary developed a massive plumbing failure of his own. A torrent of secret documents washed through the pages of *Foreign Policy* magazine. Although they all served to reveal him as the greatest negotiator since Moses bargained with God, the Secretary pronounced himself appalled.

In a move reminiscent of Richard Nixon ordering John D. Ehrlichman to get to the bottom of the Watergate cover-up, the Secretary called in his deputy, Lawrence Eagleburger, and bade him find the culprit. In three days flat, a scapegoat was discovered, formally reprimanded and Kissinger was back in his pulpit, flaying election year meddlers in foreign affairs.

An even more spectacular precedent was still reverberating in the press. District police and FBI agents set up a fencing operation, lured in local thieves, fed them meatballs and fractured Italian and bought their hot goods cut-rate. At a climax of the enterprise, they threw a party for their clients and bagged 187 enemies of society on video tape.

The brilliant coup, unremarked by the House, took 12 men, five months and about \$160,000.

The House is spending twice that to get one man.

It lacks the guile of Kissinger and the imagination of the police-FBI fencing team. Most of all, it lacks a Mr. S. Adams to put a stop to its policy.

CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA TESTIMONY ON BYINGTON NOMINATION

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD I inserted, with introductory remarks, the March 15 letter that 27 other Members of the House of Representatives and I sent to Chairman WARREN G. MAGNUSON and the other members of the Senate Commerce Committee urging the disapproval of the nomination of S. John Byington to become the new Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

On March 1, during the Commerce Committee's hearings on the Byington nomination, Carol Tucker Foreman, Executive Director of the Consumer Federation of America, delivered important and convincing testimony.

So that all Members of the House will have an opportunity to read Ms. Foreman's testimony, I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of that testimony:

TESTIMONY OF CAROL TUCKER FOREMAN, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, CONSUMER FEDERATION OF AMERICA, BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, U.S. SENATE

I am Carol Tucker Foreman, Executive Director of Consumer Federation of America, a federation of 208 national, state and local non-profit organizations that have joined together to espouse the consumer viewpoint. CFA and its member organizations represent over 30 million consumers throughout the United States. Among our members are: Consumers Union, publisher of *Consumer Reports*, 17 cooperatives and credit union leagues, 45 state and local consumer organizations, 66 rural electric cooperatives, 27 national and regional organizations ranging from the National Board of the YWCA to the National Education Association, and 16 national labor unions.

Mr. Chairman, the Consumer Product Safety Commission was established for the primary purpose of protecting the public against unreasonable risks of injury associated with consumer products. The agency was created because the Congress found that an unacceptable number of consumer products present unreasonable risks of injury. The variety and the complexity of many consumer products make many users unable to anticipate risks and to safeguard themselves adequately. Varying degrees of consumer education, sophistication and awareness intensify the problem.

In an increasingly complex and technological society, the CPSC performs an important task. The degree to which it performs that task adequately is an almost direct reflection of the integrity and the performance of the Chairman of the Commission. Section 4(f) (1) of P.L. 92-573, the law creating the Commission states that the Chairman

shall be the principal executive officer of the Commission and he shall exercise all of the executive and administrative functions of the Commission.

Increasingly, over the past several months, public criticism of the incompetence and lack of integrity of government has intensified. There is a growing hostility to government regulation. We believe that hostility grows in large part from the inadequate administration of the laws Congress has passed. In part, Congress must bear responsibility for that inadequate administration because in many cases where it has created independent regulatory agencies and required that their members be appointed with the advice and consent of the Senate, the Senate has not exercised its responsibility to approve only qualified appointees.

In recent months this Committee in particular has begun to exercise that authority vigorously. We hope that you will continue to do so. I would particularly like to commend the committee for compiling and submitting to the nominee a detailed list of questions designed to elicit information about his background, qualifications, and regulatory philosophy. This information has been made available to those who have expressed an interest in the nominee and has been an invaluable aid in preparing comments regarding his nomination. I hope the committee will continue this practice.

CFA's long-standing commitment to the appointment of highly qualified persons to government agencies is reflected in two resolutions passed at its Annual Meeting on January 24, 1976. At that time, delegates unanimously approved the following resolutions:

QUALIFICATIONS FOR REGULATORY COMMISSION MEMBERS

The President has been highly critical of the functioning of the regulatory process. In other sections of our resolutions, CFA addresses specific actions to improve the efficiency, effectiveness and fairness of regulation. An essential element of effective regulation is the appointment and confirmation of highly qualified personnel. It is the responsibility of the President to appoint only highly qualified individuals and the responsibility of the Senate to confirm only those who meet this standard.

Highly qualified must include demonstrated sensitivity to the public interest, independence of action, dedication to the furtherance of the role of the agency as well as knowledge of the subject field.

There are several existing regulatory vacancies. We insist that the President appoint only highly qualified individuals to those positions. We will not support any who are not qualified.

RESOLUTION ON S. JOHN BYINGTON

In keeping with the resolutions setting forth CFA standards for appointment of persons to regulatory commissions, CFA believes that S. John Byington, recently nominated by the President as Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, fails to meet these requirements. CFA, therefore, urges the Senate to uphold its important role in the advice and consent process and to reject Byington's nomination.

We have studied the record of the nominee and we believe he is not qualified by experience, by history of independent action, or by a dedication to the public interest.

Consumer Federation of America believes that Mr. Byington is not qualified by experience for the Chairmanship of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. Since graduating from college sixteen years ago, Mr. Byington has worked as a businessman or government official assisting businessmen in export development for a total of five years and four months and as an assistant to Governor George Romney with responsibility

in areas of communication, transportation, urban affairs, industrial and trade relations and campaigning for almost four years. Only two and one-half years of his experience appear to be substantively related to the position for which he has been nominated. This period includes his present position, held for almost two years; Assistant Prosecuting Attorney, held for six months; and pharmacist, held for four months. It is suggested that Mr. Byington's position as Deputy Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs and as Deputy Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare confers some credentials as a representative of the public interest. Whether that is so should be based on record and not on title. To base it on title only would be to suggest that the Director of Consumer Affairs for Gulf Oil would be a good public interest member of the Federal Power Commission.

The Byington record of responsiveness to the public interest is meager. Mr. Byington acknowledges his large role in the development of the Consumer Representation Plans. These plans are described as an alternative to the Agency for Consumer Advocacy. To state the issues more directly, the Consumer Representation Plans were dreamed up by the White House to justify vetoing legislation to create an independent consumer protection agency. A majority of Congress supports such legislation. All consumer groups support it. A majority of the public, according to reputable polls, supports it. The Chamber of Commerce, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Business Roundtable, Ford Motor Company and General Motors oppose it. The President has knuckled under to them and John Byington has chosen to reject the consumer interest and go along with the Chamber of Commerce and the President.

Not only were the Consumer Representation Plans developed in order to oppose the consumer position and favor the business position, the plans were initially developed with no participation by consumers. In April the President's consumer advisor, Mrs. Virginia Knauer invited consumer representatives to her office. She told the consumer representatives of the President's plan and asked for specific suggestions to be made to her on ideas for the plans. The consumer representatives expressed strong and continuing support for the Agency for Consumer Protection but also provided the Office of Consumer Affairs with a detailed paper, prepared by Public Citizen, which made a number of suggestions for improving agency procedures with regard to consumers. In addition, individual consumer representatives present at the meeting made specific suggestions for ways the agencies could be made more responsive to consumers. Not one of these suggestions can be found anywhere in the proposed Consumer Representation Plans. It is possible they were not forwarded to the individual agencies by the Office of Consumer Affairs for inclusion. If they were forwarded and rejected by the agencies, there is no indication that OCA questioned the rejection or insisted on reconsideration.

We believe that Mr. Byington's role in developing and attempting to push these phony plans off on the public is not consistent with a concern for the public interest. In addition, his willingness to advocate the creation of an Agency for Consumer Protection one year and then do an abrupt about face and oppose the legislation when it became unpopular at the White House is hardly an example of the kind of independence of thought and action that is so essential to the effective chairmanship of an independent regulatory commission.

Not only is Mr. Byington's work history predominantly industry oriented but, during

his tenure as Deputy Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs, he has spent most of his time with industry groups. The announcement of his appointment to the CPSC chairmanship was greeted warmly by industry. The toy industry trade press, *Toy and Hobby World Weekly Report* described him as a "conservative Republican . . . from Grand Rapids, Michigan, President Ford's home town . . ." The General Counsel of the Toy Manufacturers of America, Aaron Locker described Mr. Byington as "remarkably sympathetic to industry in the past." Mr. Byington's communication with consumer groups has ranged from limited to non-existent.

In responding to the Committee's request for information, Mr. Byington submitted a list of legislation opposed or supported by the Office of Consumer Affairs during his tenure there. The Office of Consumer Affairs is supposed to be the spearhead within government for the consumer interest. Consumer advocacy is listed first among OCA functions. It has a staff of 55 persons assigned to carry out its functions. In examining the list of legislation supported or opposed by the Office during Mr. Byington's tenure, several points become obvious. First, the Office of Consumer Affairs has opposed the most basic piece of consumer legislation, the creation of an Agency for Consumer Protection. Second, there are a number of important consumer bills on which the nominee and his office have remained conspicuously and totally silent. Among these are: No-Fault Automobile Insurance, the Price Disclosure Act, the Anti-Trust Improvements Act, the Anti-Trust Enforcement Authorization Act, the Competition Improvements Act, the Home Mortgage Disclosure Act (redlining), the Clinical Laboratories Improvements Act, the Beef Research and Information Act, the proposed audit of the Federal Reserve System, food stamp amendments, and the DES Control Act.

Although there is no issue before the American people that is more pressing than energy, the list of bills supported or opposed by the nominee's office does not include: H.R. 7104, the Energy Conservation and Oil Policy Act; H. Res. 641, Oil Price Decontrol; S. 1849, the Emergency Petroleum Allocation Extension, Nor did the nominee's office comment on S. 2310, the Emergency Natural Gas Deregulation Act or the proposed amendments to that legislation which would have required horizontal or vertical divestiture of the oil giants.

Third, in several cases the nominee has stated that his office supported legislation when that support cannot be found in the public records. The support mentioned involved nothing more than a reference in a speech by the nominee or Mrs. Virginia Knauer, or a press release praising the action after the bill was on the President's desk.

Perhaps the best example of this action is found in the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974 and the Equal Credit Opportunity Act Amendments approved in House-Senate Conference last week. Both of these are listed as items of legislation supported by the Office of Consumer Affairs. We are unable to find any reference in the hearing record to comments on the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of 1974 by the Office of Consumer Affairs. The role of OCA in supporting that legislation appears to have been a brief reference in a speech given by the Director of the office on October 22, 1974 after the bill had been sent to the President and a press release praising the President for signing the legislation.

Work has just been completed on the Equal Credit Opportunity Act Amendments. The only reference we can find to support of these amendments by the nominee's office is a one sentence statement in a letter to Chairman Annunzio of the Consumer Subcom-

mittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. The letter was in response to a series of questions on a number of issues forwarded to the Office of Consumer Affairs at the request of Representative Gladys Spellman. The letter says that OCA supports the amendment. I do not have to point out to the Commerce Committee members that such a statement is hardly an example of strong consumer advocacy. The Equal Credit Opportunity Act amendments were hotly debated. There was great dispute over several issues of importance to consumers, for example, (1) whether to require a written statement of reasons for denial of credit; (2) whether to exclude business credit; (3) whether to provide strong class action rights and meaningful penalties for violations of the act; and (4) whether receipt of public assistance should be among the categories protected from credit discrimination. Despite substantial efforts by the banking and retailing community to weaken the bill by eliminating these provisions, a few consumer advocates waged a lonely and often discouraging battle to ensure the strongest possible bill. Throughout that seven month struggle, absolutely no comment or support was forthcoming from the Office of Consumer Affairs.

Fourth, the Office of Consumer Affairs has commented generally on a piece of legislation without acknowledging that the essential debate is not over the bill's passage but over key amendments. While the office on a limited number of occasions endorses general principles, that office consistently retreats when industry wages massive campaigns to thwart those consumer principles with countless amendments designed to gut the legislation. Perhaps the Office of Consumer Affairs does not understand the legislative process. Perhaps they do not understand that it is the language after the title of the bill that is important to consumers.

The Office of Consumer Affairs has taken credit for proposing Truth-In-Savings legislation and has taken credit for the Nixon Administration's submission of a Truth-In-Savings bill. However, last year the Ford Administration gave little attention to that provision in resubmitting the Financial Institutions Act to Congress. In fact, the Administration's 35-page summary of the bill devoted one meager sentence to the Truth-In-Savings provision. The Office of Consumer Affairs did not appear before the Senate to testify on the legislation. During debate on the legislation, at the urging of business, the Truth-In-Savings provision was deleted. Typically, it was only after it was deleted that OCA spoke out. No serious attempt was made by OCA to preserve the provision they had presumably supported. To date there has been no communication by OCA to the Senate or the House about Truth-In-Savings other than four lines from an undated press release inserted in the 1974 record.

Although the Office of Consumer Affairs testified on the Magnuson-Moss Warranty-Federal Trade Commission Improvement Act before House and Senate committees in 1971, no one from that office testified or submitted written comments when the legislation was considered in 1973. On each of the above bills, there was strong industry involvement. Although consumers desperately needed the help of the Office of Consumer Affairs, there was no help. By refusing to become involved, the Office of Consumer Affairs in effect advanced the cause of industry, not consumers.

The record of the Office of Consumer Affairs in supporting important consumer protection legislation during the tenure of the nominee is minimal. The nominee has submitted to the Committee a list of comments on regulatory issues. It shows the record of the Office of Consumer Affairs in supporting or opposing proposed regulations is not much better.

The nominee professes great interest in and concern for issues of product safety. However, these did not seem to be of very great concern to the OCA during his tenure there. Of the list of 40 comments submitted in 1975 and to date in 1976, only two were concerned with issues pending before the Consumer Product Safety Commission. During that same period of time OCA did not comment on the proposed banning of toys and other children's articles presenting puncture or laceration injury due to sharp points (FR 1491) and on proposed amendments bicycle banning and safety regulations (FR 25480). These were actions of very great importance. In addition, the Office of Consumer Affairs did not comment on the following proposed actions by the Consumer Product Safety Commission:

FR 3279, Proposed labeling, recordkeeping and other requirements under standards FF 5-74, children's sleepwear sizes 7-14.

FR 3282, Policy statement and solicitation of comments, children's sleepwear sizes 7-14 (FF-5-74).

FR 6818, Inquiry on ammunition for hand guns, petition for banning.

FR 12111, Flammability standards, proposed simplification of procedures for establishment.

FR 20293, Proposed rules, baby cribs, non-full size; banning and safety requirements.

If the list submitted by the nominee is a full one, the Office of Consumer Affairs also failed to comment on a number of other important consumer issues pending before regulatory commissions. They did not file comments with the Federal Reserve Board on the proposed regulations for the Equal Credit Opportunity Act nor did they file comments with the Federal Power Commission on proposed new rate increases for old natural gas (Docket R 478); on direct sales from pipelines to industrial users of natural gas, bypassing FPC regulation (Docket 75-25); advance payments to natural gas producers from utilities to insure the option of purchasing gas (Docket R 411, RM 74-4).

It can be argued, of course, that it is impossible for the Office of Consumer Affairs to comment on every proposed proceeding. However, there is a very large staff at the office and the issues listed above are all of major importance. All of these proceedings were the subject of strong industry pressures opposing the consumer position. By remaining aloof, the Office of Consumer Affairs advanced the position of business, not consumers.

In responding to Committee questions, Mr. Byington has stressed advances in the Federal program of consumer education as one of the accomplishments of his tenure at the Office of Consumer Affairs. The only message from Gerald Ford on any consumer issue during his Presidency has been on the subject of consumer education. However, the President's FY 1977 budget for consumer education slashes the funds available for that program from \$3.1 million per annum to \$1.6 million, a drastic cut of almost 50%. Similarly, the budget for metric education is cut in half, going from \$2,090,000 in 1976 to \$1,045,000 in 1977. CFA is concerned that, if approved, Mr. Byington will have the same sort of success in funding CPSC.

Mr. Chairman, we believe that, other than his service as Deputy Director of the Office of Consumer Affairs, the nominee has a deplorably weak and inadequate record on which to base his qualification for appointment to this important consumer protection position. Upon examination, even that OCA record is notably unimpressive in accomplishment. There is nothing included in the record that marks Mr. Byington's tenure at OCA as one of active or effective consumer advocacy. There is a record of inaction. Because the Office of Consumer Affairs is supposed to be the leading government agency in this field, in practical effect, lack of action

becomes action against the consumer. The opposition to the Consumer Protection Agency is but one example of how consumer advocacy and protection is weakened by the position advanced by OCA. The nominee's record of action is in direct opposition to consumers' best interests and expressed desires.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission is an independent regulatory agency. Congress clearly intended that it not be subservient to the President. There is nothing in Mr. Byington's history to indicate independence. We have already noted his action in following the White House line on the Consumer Protection Agency.

The answers Mr. Byington has provided the Committee on his views of the independence of the Chairman of the Consumer Product Commission do not provide any indication that he feels strongly or is committed to independence. Perhaps this is simply because his answers to the Committee's questions are not specifically responsive to the question asked. It is our hope that the Committee will at a minimum require Mr. Byington to provide adequate responses to the following questions:

Page 22, Question 7b—Mr. Byington has not provided the simple answer the question requires. We do not know if he would support the budget submitted by the Commission even if it differs from that submitted by the President.

Page 21, Question 5—The Committee asks if Mr. Byington believes the Commission can be independent while the Justice Department controls the Commission's litigation. Mr. Byington has gone on for several lines without answering the question. Legislation embodying this concept has passed the Senate but was rejected in the House. He could easily have researched the legislative history to provide an answer. Furthermore, this is a matter of regulatory philosophy and one which will continue to be a critical issue at the Consumer Product Safety Commission. It does not require experience at the agency in question to have well defined attitudes on this subject.

While we can understand a reluctance on the part of a nominee to provide specific answers on questions of substance before entering the Commission, we believe that it is not only fair but essential that the Committee determine the nominee's view of the regulatory process. Congress has an obligation to ascertain the nominee's views on process. Mr. Byington, in his written responses to the Committee has failed to provide that much needed insight. On page 23, Question 1, Mr. Byington is asked for his view on CPSC's meeting policy. We are unable to understand why the nominee is not able to read the regulation in question and provide the Committee with his view on it. Either the nominee believes in a process for open meetings or he does not.

On Page 25, Question 4 states: Do you believe that you should list your attendance at a "get acquainted" cocktail party or reception hosted by a trade association which has petition or other matters pending before the Commission's Public Calendar? If a lobbyist were to attempt to discuss the merits of a substantial interest . . . at a party . . . would you refuse to discuss the matter until a meeting listed in the Public Calendar could be arranged? This appears to require only a simple yes or no answer. The nominee was not asked to disclose his social calendar. He was asked two very specific questions that are of great importance in affecting the regulatory process. If he cannot or will not answer affirmatively he should not be confirmed.

We find a number of the answers given to the Committee by Mr. Byington to be so obscure that they place his credibility in question. We presume that the Committee will secure adequate answers from the nominee on all questions including:

Page 7, Question 3—Mr. Byington does not answer whether his philosophy of regulation was discussed.

Page 13, Question 7(b)—This question refers to employment after leaving the Commission. We believe the response is inadequate and the nominee should be asked to include whether he will practice law in a firm which includes clients who have pending matters before the Commission. We believe the nominee should be willing to state that he will not work for a firm which represents any of the groups named.

Mr. Chairman, this Committee has devoted a great deal of effort over the past few years to the development and oversight of the Consumer Product Safety Commission. We believe you care strongly about the Commission's goals and purposes. It will be impossible for the Commission to achieve its goals if it has inadequate leadership. The proposed term of appointment of Mr. Byington is seven years. The performance of the nominee is crucial to the future of the Commission. We find nothing in his background or responses to your questions that gives cause to believe the CPSC will move toward its goals under his leadership. We urge you to reject this nomination.

LET US BURY THE "MEAN" TEST

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that my colleagues in the House listened to the views of the thousands and thousands of elderly citizens in this country and voted to extend until the fall the period during which senior citizens may continue to participate in senior citizen center activities without submitting to a degrading and demoralizing means test.

I am equally disappointed and appalled for apparently, my colleagues only listened with one ear. We should have buried this issue today forever by voting to eliminate, for all time, the means test for senior citizen center participation.

Why must we prolong the agony?

Two weeks ago, I testified before the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Public Assistance on this issue by citing letters from my elderly constituents. I put these letters in the RECORD, but obviously my colleagues did not read them. The comments made in these letters described in the most immediate and poignant way the destructive effect of the means test on the participation by senior citizens in the many activities and functions of their neighborhood centers. Our seniors' concern for the ways in which the imposition of the means test would demean them, would force financial distinctions among friends, and would impose additional strains on them emotionally and physically is heartbreaking.

Why must we prolong their anxieties and fear of humiliation, when we could easily resolve the problem once and for all by removing the means test requirement forever?

Before the end of September the entire question of eliminating the means test will have to be raised and debated once again.

In the meantime, centers will experience great difficulty in doing any long-range planning, in predicting numbers of members eligible for participation in ongoing activities, in hiring staff with any certainty of being able to retain them. All because the Congress failed to vote once and for all—with the absolute finality that the morality of this situation literally cries for—to eliminate the means test.

Extending the exemption for a few additional months certainly is better than imposing the means test now on our senior citizens. But it falls far short of what is urgently needed: The total and final burial of the means test with the proper ceremonies. I hope this will be achieved long before the exempt period is over, so that our centers staffs can go back to their real function—planning and implementing the multitude of programs and activities which keep our seniors busy, active, productive, healthy, and happy—and so that our seniors can go back to enjoying these programs free from the fears and the anxieties they have experienced since the immoral and demeaning means test requirement was first proposed.

ZULU LEADER QUERIES ROLE OF FOREIGN FUNDS IN SOUTH AFRICA

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, March 10, Nicholas Ashford filed a dispatch with the Times of London concerning foreign investment in South Africa.

Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Executive Councillor of the Kwa Zulu homeland and Dr. C. F. Byers Naudé, Director of the respected Christian Institute addressed themselves in a joint statement to this issue: "If the homelands exist to make labour available to maintain the cash economy and standard of living of the elite—black, white or both—and to establish an economic buffer zone of homeland economies to protect the central economy and provide benefit for the favoured few, we can only come to one conclusion: foreign investment in the central economy is devoid of all morality."

Mr. Speaker, this is a significant turn around for moderate South Africans living in South Africa. The words of these opponents of apartheid must be carefully pondered by the opponents of apartheid in this country.

The March 11 Ashford article and the complete statement follow:

[From the London Times, Mar. 11, 1976]

ZULU LEADER QUERIES ROLE OF FOREIGN FUNDS IN SOUTH AFRICA

FROM NICHOLAS ASHFORD,
Johannesburg, March 10.

Chief Gatsha Buthelezi, Chief Executive Councillor of the Kwa Zulu homeland and a leading black moderate, has expressed serious doubts about the role of foreign investment in South Africa, which he had previously defended.

In a joint statement with Dr. Beyers Naude, director of the Christian Institute, Chief Buthelesi states that "foreign investment in the central economy is devoid of all morality" if it serves to perpetuate a system where a white minority exploits the black majority. The two men call for a national convention in which the blacks in South Africa can speak for themselves on the matter.

They say that a radical redistribution of wealth, land and political power is essential for the establishment of a stable and moral society in South Africa. The present capitalist system, in which "the many have been blatantly crushed to produce wealth for the few", was doomed because the blacks wanted to be liberated.

The statement was in response to a newspaper interview with Mr. M. C. Botha, the Minister of Bantu Administration, suggesting that the economies of the tribal homelands, which have been promised independence, would remain interwoven with that of the republic.

Chief Buthelesi and Dr. Naude state: "If the homelands exist to make labour available to maintain the cash economy and standard of living of the elite (black, white or both) and to establish an economic buffer zone of homeland economies to protect the central economy and provide benefits for the favoured few, we can only come to one conclusion. Foreign investment in the central economy is devoid of all morality."

FOREIGN INVESTMENT IN SOUTH-AFRICA
(By C. F. Beyers Naude and Gatsha Buthelesi)

A radical redistribution of wealth, land and political power is essential for the establishment of a stable and moral society in South-Africa. In South-Africa, for over a century capitalistic paternalism has produced the conclusive evidence which makes us reject government by minority elite. Men have been consistently dehumanised, the many blatantly crushed to produce wealth for the few, and the whole of society designed to protect and intensify this naked exploitation of men by men.

We are convinced that this capitalistic endeavour is doomed. It will fail because the selfishness of South-Africa's white elite is already unrealistic and cannot survive in today's world.

It will fail because the needy millions of South-Africa require for themselves the liberation they witness amongst their brothers in neighbouring states. It will fail because no "concession" can relax the grip of capitalistic control enough to enable the oppressed masses to discover and express their own dignity and self-respect in our land.

Within this framework we must respond to the following statement by the Hon. M. C. Botha, Minister of Bantu-Administration and Development: "...in the economic framework of the country, the economy of the homelands is interwoven with that of the republic. And it stands to reason that the development of the homelands cannot be carried out at a pace which would have a detrimental effect on the economy of the country..."

If the homelands exist to make labour available to maintain the cash-economy and standard of living of the elite (black, white or both) and to establish an economic bufferzone of homeland-economies to protect the central economy and provide benefit for the favoured few, we can come to only one conclusion: foreign investment in the central economy is devoid of all morality. It is equally evident that attempts to increase the responsibility of employers and investors within this system will do nothing to produce the radical redistribution of wealth and power which are the essential prerequisites of justice and peace. Nor can professional economists in theoretical debates produce a relevant solution. Progress depends on realising

the priorities and power locked in the wisdom of the black man, who has suffered and will survive to make the real contribution to the new society which he is seeking.

Whites in South Africa have denied blacks access to the central parliamentary decisionmaking process. They have imposed on blacks a divide and rule policy as though the blacks of the country have no right to speak on issues of national importance. The question of investment in South-Africa is one such issue.

We call for a national convention in which the blacks in South-Africa can speak for themselves on the matter of foreign investment.

THE PANAMA CANAL

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 16, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I was not able to be on the floor yesterday to participate in the special order requested by Congressman DAN FLOOD on the subject of the Panama Canal. At this time, I wish to commend my colleague and good friend from Pennsylvania for his tireless efforts to turn the attention of this body, and the country, to the question of continued U.S. sovereignty over the Panama Canal and Canal Zone. DAN FLOOD is the unquestioned leader of those who support the rightful control by the United States of the canal and Canal Zone. All Americans owe Representative FLOOD grateful thanks for his untiring activity.

The United States has sovereignty in the Panama Canal Zone and over the Panama Canal. In my opinion, it would be to the detriment of both the United States and Panama to relinquish our present status there by transferring sovereignty to the country of Panama. The Panama Canal has for over 60 years played a vital role in the strategic and commercial life of the United States. It served us well during World War I, World War II, the Korean war, the Cuban missile crisis, and during our involvement in Vietnam as a transport route between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans. It would be folly to adopt a policy that would jeopardize the transit of goods and soldiers to a war zone. It would be folly to risk a Communist stranglehold on Western Hemisphere trade and shipping. The United States has built, operated, and maintained the canal, not only for ourselves but for other countries of the world. Since the canal was opened in August of 1914, it has been available to ships of all nations at all times on equal terms. It has served to strengthen the security of the United States and of the free world. We must ask ourselves if this would be the case if sovereignty was relinquished and the frequently unstable government of Panama gained control.

As I stated in my remarks to this body on December 9, 1975, the U.S. Congress must maintain its constitutional rights, responsibilities and duties in the Canal Zone. Only the Congress has the power to "dispose of and make all needful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or other Property belonging to the

United States." We must actively oppose the so-called Agreement on Principles, approved by Secretary Kissinger which clearly envisions the surrender of U.S. sovereignty in the Canal Zone. I believe I speak for the majority of the American people when I say that we cannot be swayed by any demands regarding the sovereignty terms of the 1903 treaty under which we built, maintained, and protected the canal. Instead, let our consistent policy affirm that any Panamanian desires to improve the economic and social status of that nation, in accordance with the terms of the 1903 treaty, will be considered in a favorable light by the people of the United States and our Government.

Once again, I wish to commend my colleague, Mr. FLOOD, for his perseverance and dedication and I urge the Members of this body to support his efforts.

**THE BALANCE(S) OF POWER: I—
THE U.S. STRATEGIC SITUATION**

HON. JOHN BRECKINRIDGE

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. BRECKINRIDGE. Mr. Speaker, the balance of military power has shifted sharply from the United States toward the Soviet Union since the Cuban missile crisis 14 years ago. Fundamental trends, as traced by John M. Collins, senior specialist in National Defense for the Library of Congress—in a study entitled "The United States/Soviet Military Balance" prepared for Senator JOHN C. CULVER and published by the Senate Armed Services Committee January 21, 1976—reveal a profound transformation in U.S. policy and posture since that time:

In the early 1960's, this country still occupied the pinnacle of world power, secure at home and strong overseas.

Thereafter, some U.S. Armed Forces improved technologically, but a relative decline in combat power characterizes many others in comparison with the Soviets.

For the first time since the American Revolution a competitor has the capability to destroy this Nation if it cares to run the risk.

To guard against that eventuality the United States now depends on mutual vulnerability, diplomacy, and arms control measures to insure nuclear deterrence.

Should a nuclear exchange occur nonetheless, we are exposed to its full effects having all but repudiated strategic defenses that could limit U.S. casualties and damage.

The prevailing nuclear stalemate, the long-term durability of which is dubious, magnifies the importance of conventional U.S. forces to deter and, if need be, cope with subordinate threats.

Despite that situation, this country has cut its active general purpose forces by more than a third since 1969, although U.S. security treaty commitments have expanded.

To safeguard its national interests, the United States therefore must rely heavily on reserve components, whose readiness is spotty, and on a global alliance system that exhibits significant cracks.

As implications of such developments are debatable, I plan to publish a series of articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD over the ensuing months supporting my contention that Soviet military strength will significantly outclass the United States in the short-term future unless current trends are reversed.

Subjects to be covered will include, but not be limited to:

1. A panoramic perspective.
2. Strategic offensive balance.
3. Strategic defensive balance.
4. Ground force balance.
5. Naval balance.
6. Tactical air force balance.
7. Strategic mobility balance.
8. Budgetary balance.
9. Scientific/technological balance.
10. Balance in Europe.
11. Balance in East Asia.
12. Balance in Middle East.
13. Balance in the Indian Ocean.
14. Balance in Africa.
15. Balance in Latin America.

The U.S./Soviet military balance, of course, constitutes only a part of the strategic equation. I intend, therefore, to introduce a series of companion articles that concern national power in its broader perspective: political considerations, both foreign and domestic; strengths and weaknesses of national institutions; geographic factors and situations; economies, especially natural resources, including industrial capacity agriculture and finances; national character; and leadership.

Having covered the U.S./Soviet strategic balance in some depth, the series will then touch on other countries that contribute to this country's global balance of strategic strengths and weaknesses, both present and projected. Outlines for those items will appear at a later date.

In each case the series will relate coverage to crucial U.S. security interests, which Collins summarizes as follows:

Survival: The irreducible security interest is survival, under conditions that preserve independence, fundamental institutions and values intact. This concern was academic throughout most of our history, because the United States was so insulated by time and space—oceans—that no foreign power could imperil our existence. America's survival in the 20th century is imperiled by the Soviets' strategic nuclear strike force.

Physical security: Safeguarding individual elements of the national entity, especially geographic integrity, key population centers, transportation and productive capacities was—like survival—largely a self-satisfying U.S. interest until the past decade. Physical security of the United States can no longer be taken for granted, given the Soviet Union's nuclear strength and growing naval power.

Peace: Even limited strife between U.S. and Soviet associates conceivably could escalate to general nuclear war (say with Warsaw Pact nations or in the Middle East). Peace therefore is a salient

U.S. interest, expressed by successive presidents for the past 30 years.

National credibility: Credibility is an indispensable asset for any nation that aspires to international leadership, or hopes to function effectively as a global power. It comprises demonstrable capabilities, intentions, fortitude, and integrity, without which no deterrent of defense program can command the respect of opponents, allies or the uncommitted. This country's interest in credibility increased by orders of magnitude after World War II, when American military might became the Free World bulwark.

Freedom of action: Finally, freedom of action—sometimes called flexibility—overlaps all other U.S. interests. It is the key to strategic initiative, without which this country would be compelled to react to Soviet schemes, which would control our course.

The second issue, *The Panoramic Perspective*, I plan for publication in the RECORD on March 31.

AMENDMENT TO TITLE XIX OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing an amendment to title XIX of the Social Security Act, specifically dealing with clinical laboratory reform and cost control in the medicare program.

Under this amendment States will be allowed to purchase laboratory clinical services for medicare recipients through competitive bidding. Laboratory services could then be done only by those laboratories which provide high quality services at the most reasonable price. A second provision mandates that laboratory charges billed for by a physician but performed in a laboratory must be based on actual costs plus a nominal charge determined by the State to be reasonable. Such abuses, as recently cited in the hearings before the Senate Committee on Aging, of medicare being billed for \$58 for a test costing \$3.40 would be outlawed under this amendment.

Under the existing freedom of choice provision in title XIX States and localities have been prevented from instituting competitive bidding for clinical laboratory services. In reality, patient "freedom of choice" in selecting a laboratory for their clinical tests is a concept with very little basis in fact. The vast majority of patients have absolutely no say whatever in which laboratory processes their tests. Their needs, as both patient and taxpayer, would best be served by having laboratory tests performed by high quality, reasonably priced laboratories selected through a competitive bidding process.

Kickbacks and rebates are rampant and endemic in the existing medicare laboratory program. Fraudulent billing and overpayments are everyday practices. Honest laboratories have been vir-

tually barred from obtaining medicare accounts. It is estimated that of \$180.5 million paid to laboratories for specimen analysis, at least \$45 million are siphoned off illicitly in costs that are either fraudulent or clearly unnecessary. In New York City alone, laboratory costs under medicare rose from \$3 million in 1970 to \$10.5 million in 1974 although fewer persons were enrolled in the program in 1974 than in 1970.

On February 13 I chaired hearings of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on medicare fraud and abuse in New York City. The hearings dramatized the urgent need for an end to the open doors and loopholes in the medicare program which are costing the taxpayer hundreds of millions of dollars each year. This amendment will be a constructive first step in improving an existing Federal health program by eliminating much of the systematic fraud and abuse, involving tens of millions of dollars annually before we commit ourselves to an even larger and uncontrolled Federal obligation in the form of national health insurance.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 280

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of our colleagues statements by Common Cause and by the League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia in support of the amendment which I will offer the House Joint Resolution 280, the District of Columbia representation legislation.

I would appreciate your consideration of my amendment and the reasons given in the following letters to support it:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D.C., March 17, 1976.

HON. JOHN BUCHANAN,
2159 Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BUCHANAN: The League of Women Voters of the District of Columbia is vitally concerned with the passage of H.J.R. 280, which would provide for a Constitutional Amendment to grant citizens of the District of Columbia full voting representation in Congress. It has been and continues to be our position that citizens of the District of Columbia should be allowed the same rights as all other citizens in the United States of America. Therefore, we would find any diminution of this unsatisfactory.

However, if a compromise amendment becomes the only means to gain full House support for passage of H.J.R. 280 we favor your amendment granting one voting representative now, with enlarged representation to follow by Congressional action.

Our sister Leagues in all 50 states helped greatly in our Home Rule effort and are all supporting us in this attempt to gain full voting rights. They will likewise exert themselves in the State legislatures when the Constitutional amendment is ratified.

An amendment such as the Railsback-

Flowers proposed, which would necessitate further Constitutional amendments would, we feel, be totally unsatisfactory, because of the prospect it presents of prolonged waiting and additional national effort to secure full voting representation.

We appreciate your support of our basic position and hope we will soon all be working together for the passage of a bill that will be mutually satisfactory.

Sincerely,

ELLYN W. SWANSON,
President.

COMMON CAUSE,

Washington, D.C., March 16, 1976.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: H.J. Res. 280, a constitutional amendment providing full voting representation in Congress for the District of Columbia is scheduled for a House floor vote on Wednesday, March 18. The resolution would provide the District of Columbia two Senators and representation in the House based on the Congressional apportionment formula.

At least two amendments to the constitutional amendment are anticipated. The first amendment, to be introduced by Representative Buchanan, is a full representative bill providing one immediate representative in the House and the authority for Congress to extend additional voting representation in the House by law, not to exceed that representation which the District would be entitled to under the Congressional apportionment formula. In addition, the Buchanan amendment would give Congress the authority to provide by law one or two voting representatives in the Senate.

A second amendment, to be offered by Representatives Rallsback and Flowers, would limit Congressional representation to the House. No current or future representation would be provided in the Senate. This shortsighted amendment ignores the fact that it requires action by both bodies to enact any federal law, those governing the District of Columbia or any others. It would be grossly inequitable if the 750,000 District residents would continue to be banned from participation in those national matters handled solely by the Senate, such as the confirmation and treaty-making processes.

Common Cause urges you to be present and to vote for H.J. Res. 280 or such other constitutional amendment as would provide at minimum, immediate representation in the House, and authority for future representation in either body not to exceed the number the District would be entitled to under the normal Congressional representation formula. We also urge you to oppose any amendment which would limit representation for the District of Columbia solely to the House of Representatives.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. GARDNER.

PENSION REFORM AND SMALL BUSINESS

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, for many years small businesses provided pension plans to their employees on a voluntary basis. It is quite remarkable the number of pension plans sponsored by small business over the years. However, with the enactment of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act in 1974, the situation is changing very rapidly.

Because of the additional cost and complexity of administering pension

programs under the new law, an alarming number of businesses are now being forced to terminate successful pension programs which they had sponsored for many years. Many of these small businesses are not equipped or staffed to comply with the extremely complex regulations implementing the new law.

I joined with 69 other Members of the U.S. House of Representatives this week in an appeal to the General Accounting Office to conduct an immediate investigation of the effects of the Pension Reform Act on small businesses. I would hope that such an investigation can be undertaken as quickly as possible and that it will be a thorough and complete study of the facts.

To date over 5,000 notices of intent to terminate pension plans have been filed with the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, one of the three Government agencies with combined—and often duplicative—responsibility for administering ERISA. The impact of these cancellations on employees and their relationship with their employers should be obvious. This situation cannot be allowed to continue. Congress has a responsibility to see that pension reform does not become pension obliteration.

BELVERON PARK IN TIBURON, CALIF. COMPLETED

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the revenue sharing legislation is up for consideration and renewal, I think it is important to indicate the type of things that have been done by some local governments with these Federal funds.

Recently the city of Tiburon, which I have the honor to represent in the Congress, completed its neighborhood facility, Belveron Park.

The park was proposed in 1968 by the Belveron Homeowners Association as a neighborhood project to provide a safe playground for small children. The project was authorized in 1971 after the city acquired the property from the Northwestern Pacific Railroad, and a generous donation by an adjacent property owner.

In 1974 the Parks and Recreation Commission, with the help of a volunteer landscape architect and the Belveron community, obtained city council approval and funding to expand the original playground concept to a landscaped park that would meet the needs of the Belveron neighborhood. The city was able to fund the project with the exception of \$6,800.

Revenue Sharing funds in that amount were allocated toward the final project cost of \$38,625. This Federal assistance helped provide for a professional landscape contractor whose work progressed under the watchful eye of Belveron neighbors. The Belveron Homeowners Association donated not only time, but a park bench. Another park bench was donated by the Shark Lions Club of Tibu-

ron, making this a broad community project.

The park was completed in August 1975 and officially dedicated by George Ellman, mayor of Tiburon, on October 26, 1975.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY PARADE IN HOLYOKE, MASS.

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, today, as the Irish—and as is popularly said, those who wish they were Irish—celebrate the feast of the patron saint of Ireland, St. Patrick, I salute the 25th anniversary of the Holyoke, Mass. St. Patrick's Day parade. I would also like to take this opportunity to commend the Irish-American community in that city and around the country in this Bicentennial Year on the great contributions the Irish have made to the building of America.

The Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade is an event that annually draws throngs of hundreds of thousands of spectators to the city of Holyoke.

Twenty-five years ago, on March 16, 1952, the first Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade stepped off on High Street under the direction of parade committee officials, William Lunney, president; William P. Sullivan, vice president; Thomas Mulvihill, secretary; and Emmett J. Cauley, treasurer.

Today, a committee of some 150 citizens coordinate the endeavor, whose activities have grown from a single parade to a series of events, including a colleen contest, a coronation ball, a songfest, a benefit to assist a parade committee scholarship drive, and receptions to honor award winners. This year's counterparts to the original parade officials include: Maurice J. Ferriter, president; John E. McHugh, first vice president; Roger Breen, second vice president; Russell J. McNiff, treasurer; Dr. Francis M. Baker, financial secretary and chairman of the Board of Directors; John J. Mansfield, recording secretary; and Leo J. Hickson, sergeant at arms.

The coveted parade awards, given in several categories, honor men and women of Irish and non-Irish descent. Leading this year's award winners is Attorney Edward Bennett Williams of Washington, D.C., who has been named to receive the John F. Kennedy Memorial Award, an honor bestowed upon "an American of Irish ancestry who, by his life's work and contributions to our country, has become a credit to his forefathers and a friend and benefactor to all of mankind." Parade marshal for this anniversary edition of the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade will be Richard J. Murphy, managing editor of the Holyoke Transcript-Telegram. And winner of the Citizenship Award, given to a person of non-Irish extraction for wholeheartedly supporting the parade, is Louis J. Ryback.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot lay claim to any Irish blood. But each year for the past 25, I have marched proudly in the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade with my

Irish friends. What has impressed me most about the parade is the enthusiasm it generates among all of the residents of Holyoke—those of all ethnic backgrounds and of all ages. It is not only a community festival, and a superb one, but its renown has spread so that the spirit of the parade encompasses the entire western Massachusetts area.

I am looking forward to marching this Sunday, March 21, in the 1976 Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade and I take this time to congratulate all of those persons who have been involved over the past 25 years in making the Holyoke St. Patrick's Day parade one of the foremost of its kind in the Nation.

**TENNESSEE LEGISLATURE THANKS
AND COMMENDS JOE L. EVINS FOR
HIS LONG RECORD OF OUTSTAND-
ING SERVICE IN THE CONGRESS**

HON. CLIFFORD ALLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the distinguished dean of the Tennessee delegation, Congressman JOE L. EVINS, has announced that he will not seek reelection to the Congress following completion of this term.

In this connection, the Tennessee General Assembly recently passed Joint Resolution No. 164 expressing thanks to the gentleman from Tennessee and commending him for his outstanding record of public service spanning 15 terms and 30 years in the Congress.

JOE L. EVINS has served his district, State, and Nation faithfully and well. He is one of the great Tennesseans of all time and history will record his great achievements and accomplishments for Tennessee and the Nation, along with such other outstanding Tennessean giants as Andrew Jackson, James K. Polk, Andrew Johnson, Sam Houston, and Cordell Hull. JOE L. EVINS has served longer in continuous service in the Congress than any other Tennessean in history.

As the Congressman from the "Andrew Jackson District," I am pleased to have this honor of placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolution passed by both houses of the Tennessee General Assembly and signed by Gov. Ray Blanton, officially thanking and commending Congressman EVINS for his tireless and productive career of public service for the people of Tennessee and the Nation:

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION No. 164

A resolution to express thanks to Congressman JOE L. EVINS, of Smithville, on his thirty years of service to the people of Tennessee in the United States Congress

Whereas, One of the most powerful and influential officials on the national scene for the past several years has been Tennessee's Fourth District Congressman JOE L. EVINS, of Smithville, who has been an outstanding congressman since 1947; and

Whereas, The "Dean" of the Tennessee congressional delegation has for some time been chairman of the House Appropriations Committee's powerful Subcommittee on Pub-

lic Works Appropriations and chairman of the House Small Business Committee, and has been chairman of other influential committees and subcommittees at various times during his congressional career; and

Whereas, Congressman EVINS has recently announced publicly his intention not to seek reelection in 1976 after thirty years of outstanding service and leadership on "The Hill," a decision which will mean the loss of a powerful voice in Washington on behalf of Tennessee and Tennesseans; and

Whereas, In his thirty years of dedicated service in the Congress he has risen to a high state of prominence and respect, attained through a diligent application of some good advice he received years ago from the late Cordell Hull that, "Of the many qualities necessary in being a successful Congressman, two of the most important are patience and perseverance. Be patient and keep plugging for success," and some equally good advice from his father, J. Edgar EVINS—"... always remember there is no substitute for honesty, loyalty, and sincerity. Make this your motto"; and

Whereas, As he lays down his burden of responsibility, all Tennesseans, and particularly those of the Fourth District, can know and take pride in a simple truth spoken by former President Lyndon B. Johnson concerning JOE L. EVINS, that "Generations of Americans yet unborn will benefit from the labors of this man"; now, therefore,

Be it resolved by the Senate of the eightyninth General Assembly of the State of Tennessee, the House of Representatives concurring, That the thanks and appreciation of the General Assembly are hereby extended to the Honorable JOE L. EVINS, of Smithville, for his thirty years of loyal, dedicated service in the United States Congress, representing Tennessee's Fourth Congressional District with style and dignity as one of the most distinguished and hardest working members of the Congress, and that our best wishes go with him as he retires to private life.

Be it further resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman JOE L. EVINS, 2300 Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, AMERICA!

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, William F. Farha, a businessman and distinguished citizen of Wichita, Kans., whose family emigrated from Lebanon to the United States has taken the time during this Bicentennial year to express his thanks for being an American. Mr. Farha's personal thoughts on being a citizen of this great land are inspiring to me, and I would like to bring them to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Farha's essay which he had published in the Wichita, Kans., Beacon.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, AMERICA!

1776 BICENTENNIAL 1976

I thank God in being an American. I also thank God that my family 81 years ago left Lebanon to come to America. Who knows? If we hadn't come to America we could have been killed or injured within the past 9 months of senseless fighting. Where else in the world could you have the freedom, jus-

tice, mercy, and opportunity for every American regardless of what country you came from or what race, color, or creed you belong to? Where else in the world will you find over \$25 billion last year was given to charities by the American people? We always seem to condemn our people, our country, in our society, I'm not saying that the American people are perfect, but certainly the majority of the people love mercy, and are courageous enough to justly remove even the person of the highest office and walk humbly with God. To me this is the American spirit. I believe the intention of the American people is to be good citizens and to be free in thought indeed, and is to be creative and useful with our minds, hands, and above all, to believe in one God as our Father and always to remember the Biblical verse stating, "Blessed is the nation whose God is the Lord."

William F. Farha, Wichita.

**THE ST. LOUIS SENIOR CITIZEN
CENTER**

HON. FREDERICK W. RICHMOND

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, the St. Louis Senior Citizen Center is a community center for the elderly located in the 14th Congressional District. Recently, 430 members of the SLSCC gathered to honor the acting director, Mr. Ernest A. Smith, as their "Man of the Year." Mr. Smith has been actively involved in a number of community affairs for some time now, and has brought these experiences with him to his present position. It is obvious that his efforts are well appreciated.

A recent article in the Brooklyn Record detailed the past activities of Mr. Smith, and also noted the very warm atmosphere at the gathering which carries from the center into the surrounding community. There is an important sense of sharing existing within the center which is essential to the future of our cities and our Nation.

The members of the center are all individuals who have lived very full productive lives, and who continue to do so through their activities at the center. The St. Louis Senior Citizens Center, and others like it, should remind us that our senior citizens should not become forgotten members of our society. These people have contributed a great deal to our growth, and can continue to do so if we only let them.

The article from the Brooklyn Record follows:

**ST. LOUIS SENIOR CITIZEN CENTER: A HOUSE
FULL OF RICH HAPPINESS**

77TH PRECINCT PLAQUE AWARDED TO
ERNEST SMITH

A house full of happiness. That's the way Community Relations Detective Stanley Gibbs characterized the beautiful St. Louis Senior Citizen Center where some 431 neighbors gathered at lunch to honor Acting Director Ernest A. Smith, their "Man of the Year" and present him with a plaque donated by the 77th Precinct saying so.

Smith comes to the Catholic Charities sponsored St. Louis Center at 839 St. Marks Ave. where all creeds are welcome, with a long list of accomplishments: Supervisor

Bed-Stuy, Crown Heights, and St. John The Baptist Human Service Centers, Board Advisor Flatland Guidance Clinic and a sponsor Christian Concern Group at St. Vincent Ferrer parish.

A symbolic plaque was presented to him by Anna Marie Blinn and together they danced the "presentation waltz" to the tune of "The Decades", talented senior citizens musical group. Songfest led by vivacious program director Sister Catherine Anne Greene set the tempo for after luncheon "halloween" festivities.

Participants included Mrs. Anne Holder-ness, Dir. Office of Aging Services, Catholic Charities; Mrs. Jessie Easter, Operational Manager Crown Heights Human Service Center; Capt. Robert Turner of Fire Dept.; and Charles Richman, editor of Brooklyn Record.

Strolling along the neighborhood on a sunny fall afternoon, one can hardly believe that news and tv media stressing racial conflicts and drug operations present a fair evaluation of the area. The homes are magnificent exemplary architecture with an abundance of tudor style enclaves and the tree lined streets, multicolored by nature's paint brush, present an eye-pleasing and invigorating scene.

Det. Gibbs who represented Deputy Inspector Hugh J. B. Cassidy, Commander of the 77th Precinct, summed it all up. He'd like to bottle the happiness permeating the party so that he could have a few whiffs from it on not so happy occasions and there are plenty of them during a policeman's tour.

Those who would cut budgets for senior center operations should take time out to see that they could do irreparable damage to the citizens who gave the nation their best and now should enjoy the fruits of their labor and taxes. The retirement years should be the rich years and there should be more places such as the St. Louis Center where senior citizens can meet, eat and greet, regardless of "means" in enriched fellowship which makes for a tonic no doctor's prescription can surpass. We know, for we shared a table with a retired pharmacist who served the neighborhood for over 40 years after graduating from Brooklyn College of Pharmacy.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, today most Americans are wearing a bit of green to signify that they hold a special place for the spirit that is uniquely Irish. That spirit brought the sons and daughters of Ireland to this country where they helped build a nation with compassion, and understanding and opportunity for all people.

The warmth and wisdom of the Irish are found in every aspect of American life—its art, its politics, and, indeed, its very fiber.

We can only hope that these qualities will prevail in Ireland and we wish for its people an end to violence and the restoration of the principles to which St. Patrick himself was dedicated.

Last weekend in the city of Newark, I was honored to join thousands of people who paraded to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. Newark is composed of citizens of all heritages, but the crowds in attendance reflected the respect and kinship

found in my district for those of Irish descent.

I think it is indicative of the Irish that here in America and around the world millions of people of every nationality and creed are today saying, "I am an Irishman."

TRIBUTE TO THE IRISH

HON. JEROME A. AMBRO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. AMBRO. Mr. Speaker, on this St. Patrick's Day as we near the 60th anniversary of the Easter Uprising of 1916 in Dublin, Ireland, I think it fitting that we pause to reflect on the contributions of the Irish people and their descendants to American culture and politics.

The waves of Irish immigrants who poured into our teeming cities during the half century beginning in the 1880's brought with them a love of freedom and deep longing for independence that was forged in a centuries-old cauldron of armed insurrection against political oppression and religious persecution.

This stream of immigrants searching for self-determination began to ebb only when the Irish people won independence and self-government through a bloody rebellion against colonial domination. On Easter Sunday 1916, 1,200 men marched into the streets of Dublin and unleashed a force that in 3 years brought to birth the independent Republic of Ireland.

The strong ties between the American and Irish peoples remain firmly knotted in both war and peace. It was a Brooklyn-born mathematics teacher, the late Eamon DeValera, who politically and militarily led the Irish rebels through the strife-torn rebellion.

In that struggle, the Irish leaders were careful to stress that their effort was aimed not at creating a new nation, but rather at reasserting the historic, inalienable right of the Irish people to the control of Irish destinies. The Irish declaration of independence proudly stated—

The long usurpation of that right by a foreign peoples and government has not extinguished the right, nor can it ever be extinguished, except by the destruction of the Irish people.

This same strong tradition of political independence and love of freedom was infused into the American system by those immigrants who came to our shores.

In the American democracy, the Irish found political mobility and a safety valve release for centuries of repressed political ambitions. They quickly spotted the potential for political gain that their numbers represented in our eastern cities.

In Boston and New York City, these Irish immigrants and first-generation Irish-Americans moved to wrest control from the aristocratic Brahmins who had ruled these cities since the American Revolution.

The Irish set the tone for the immi-

grant Italians, Jews and other European ethnic groups that followed. Today in similar fashion, Hispanics and Blacks are consolidating their bases of political power and sending their representatives to city hall, Washington and State capitals.

With political power comes slow, often painful social advancement.

The offspring of these uneducated Irish immigrants entered our American universities and, in time, gained entry into our professions and corporate suites of our multibillion corporations.

Predictably, the mark of the rich Irish culture was indelibly imprinted on American arts and letters. A stroll through the shelves of plays, novels or poetry in any of our libraries reveals a disproportionately high number of surnames only a few years removed from the soil of Cork, Galway, Killarney, Down, and the other Irish counties.

The Irish legacy to American arts and politics is as broad as it is deep.

The Irish have traditionally gravitated to "people" careers—fields that bring them in contact with others where their charming ways and magnetic personalities can win over the most skeptical antagonists.

At one time or another, we have all been pleasantly jolted by those legendary flashes of Irish wit and captivated by the warmth of these heirs to the Emerald Isle.

During the rebellion of 1916, the Irish leaders were fond of reminding their people that "England's difficulties are Ireland's opportunities." It can truly be said that Ireland's preindependence difficulties, those problems that pushed hundreds of thousands of Irishmen and Irishwomen to our land, were indeed "America's opportunities."

Our country is richer and stronger for the Irish people who settled here. The contributions of these people and their descendants have been, and continue to be impressive. This Government and our people owe them much.

A WELCOME TO THE PRIME MINISTER OF IRELAND

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to welcome the Prime Minister of Ireland, Liam Cosgrave, who has taken over the reins of a troubled country. We are pleased that he has chosen this traditional Irish holiday to visit the U.S. Congress. He has been in Irish politics for 32 years, having been elected to Parliament at the age of 23. He has had a distinguished and colorful career capped by his election to head the Irish Republic.

This observance of St. Patrick's Day creates a situation where the distinguished majority leader and myself can be in agreement. It is a great day for the

Irish, and for his home town of Boston, where in 1779 the Irish volunteers first paraded, and then proceeded to join George Washington's Army and become part of the fight for a free America. Our national culture has been influenced greatly by the millions of Irish who came to these shores and helped build our Nation. The Society of the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick has nourished the Irish observance of St. Patrick's Day since 1771 when they were organized in Philadelphia.

We are most pleased to have Erin's leader here on this auspicious day, when all Americans are a little bit Irish.

ONE MAN'S BATTLE AGAINST OSHA

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 has been in operation nearly 5 years—it became effective April 28, 1971—and the flood of complaints and horror stories increases daily from those employers trying to comply with the multitude of complex regulations issued by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration. Many of us here in the House have participated in special orders, supported amendments, and introduced bills to either control the proliferation of OSHA regulations, to aid employers in compliance with the regulations, or to repeal the 1970 act and abolish the administration altogether. Constituent support for these efforts has been high and is growing every day.

OSHA regulation has, in many cases, imposed costly demands on employers and hampered production capability of employees. Harassment by uninformed and inexperienced inspectors has occurred with alarming frequency while the paperwork burden has become truly mountainous. It is time this Congress stopped creating bureaucracies and then leaving them to run roughshod over the American taxpayers who are forced to support these agencies. We must exercise the constitutional congressional oversight responsibility to assure that unreasonable Government mandates do not interfere with the citizen's right to do business. At a time when regulatory reform is becoming increasingly popular, we must start to put some punch behind the campaign rhetoric and carefully examine the functions and roles of our many regulatory agencies. And certainly, OSHA is a good starting point.

At this time, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the January, 1976 issue of "Government Executive" entitled, "One Man's Battle Against OSHA." In fact, this article should be required reading for all members, especially those serving on the Education and Labor Committee which has the oversight responsibility in this case.

[The article is reprinted in its entirety from The New Englander "New England's Business Magazine", with kind permission from its Editor, Bradford W. Ketchum, Dublin, N.H., 03444.]

ONE MAN'S BATTLE AGAINST OSHA (By Raymond J. Larson)

"I won't pay the damn thing. Paying it would make me a criminal. I am a businessman trying to run an honest business." Howard Dearborn, President, Howard Dearborn, Inc. Fryeburg, Maine.

Basically, Howard Dearborn wants to be left alone. He does not want the government coming around telling him what to do (he calls it "damn government meddling"); he does not care at all for the increasing regulation Uncle Sam exerts over the operation of his precision machine shop in rural Fryeburg, Maine.

He has, you might say, a healthy mistrust of big government, and he cannot resist taking a potshot at it now and then. For example, when Warner & Swasey, Cleveland, ran an advertisement recently, entitled "Memo to Washington: You'd Be Surprised What Most of Us Do Without—You Ought to Try It Sometime," he sent the president of W&S a letter which said:

"I sincerely agree that the relationship between the number of productive people in the United States and the number of unproductive people in government employed to regulate and harass the productive few is to the point of alarm. The productive few are paying the unproductive many to regulate and harass them. Yet the government cannot seem to understand why we have inflation."

With such an attitude, when the U.S. Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) announced that it was going to visit Dearborn's 18,000-sq. ft. plant last year, a collision was inevitable.

The fact that the collision took place on schedule is hardly news in itself. But its repercussions are still being felt, both by Dearborn and the federal government; and before everything is sifted out and settled, some hard questions about OSHA operations and its regulations will have to be answered.

Dearborn built the company that bears his name by designing and building special machinery for precision boring, honing and drilling of such difficult materials as beryllium, zirconium, titanium and stainless steel. His customers, most of them in the nuclear reactor field, send parts to his shop from all over the U.S.—sometimes reluctantly.

"If there were any place else for some of them to go other than way up here," he says, "they would. But there is no other place; we're it."

Because of his unique niche in metalworking, Dearborn has been free until now to turn his attention to those things that interest him most, such as the recent development of a new generation of machinery for making uniform-walled tubing.

But Robert McNeally's visit to Dearborn's plant June 24, 1974, changed all that. McNeally is a compliance officer of OSHA.

McNeally liked most of what he saw. He would later testify before the Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission that "the plant is in good physical condition. The housekeeping is fine. There were a few violations noted of the code, but I believe the company is very safety conscious and is doing its best to comply."

But because of one of those "few violations"—"nonserious" is how McNeally himself characterized it in his citation—the OSHA compliance officer decided that Dearborn, Inc. was liable for a fine of \$25. And on July 5, the U.S. Labor Dept. sent Dearborn a Notification of Proposed Penalty in which he was informed that Howard Dearborn, Inc. was liable for a \$25 fine because

it had "failed to replace welding electrode cable which has damaged insulation and exposed bare conductors."

Howard Dearborn wouldn't pay. Instead, he hired Attorney Thomas D. Shaffner, who on Aug. 20, 1974, filed a response with the Review Commission. It said, in part:

"At the outset it should be made abundantly clear that the respondent is as interested as OSHA in providing a safe and healthy environment for its employees. In fact, a great deal of time, energy and money is expended in this regard. A penalty is only useful as a deterrent to future conduct of the type for which the penalty was levied. Since the respondent is desirous of preventing any recurrence of the alleged unsafe condition, it wants the penalty to be levied against the person who created it and/or permitted it to exist. Thus the penalty must necessarily be levied against either the employee(s) actually using the welder or the foreman to whom the welders report or the superintendent of the plant."

"During the course of discussion of the alleged OSHA violation with the above described employees, however, it was learned that none of them knew of the subject OSHA regulation. If they had known of it, steps would have been taken to correct any deviation therefrom. To penalize a person for not knowing of a regulation of the U.S. government, without first advising such person, amount to a violation of due process."

To make it clear that the violation itself was not the issue, Shaffner that same day notified T. R. Amirault, area director of the U.S. Dept. of Labor in Concord, N.H., that the "welding cable was actually replaced to alleviate any and all disputes with respect to the safety of its repaired condition."

On Oct. 29, 1974, a hearing was held in Portland, Me., before David J. Knight, administrative law judge for the Review Commission, and on June 26, 1975, Judge Knight issued his opinion. Knight found that the Dearborn plant "is in good physical condition, is safety conscious, and the compliance officer believes it does its best to comply with the regulations." But he went on to order that the \$25 fine be enforced, saying that Dearborn, Inc., "was under obligation to advise its employees of the safe operations of the arc welding machinery" but failed to do so.

Dearborn still won't pay. "The first time I ever had anything to do with OSHA was the time the inspector came here," he says. "We never saw any book of rules and regulations or anything else. We got fined for not knowing, even though they never told us in the first place. There are so many people passing laws these days you couldn't read them all in one lifetime."

"We got the impression that the fine might have been partly to help pay for sending the inspector here. So we offered to pay an inspection fee; we offered to pay OSHA \$100 to come up here and inspect the place and find everything that's wrong. But as for this fine, I won't pay the damn thing. Paying it would make me a criminal and I'm no criminal. I'm a businessman trying to run an honest business."

Because he felt so strongly about it, Dearborn instructed Shaffner to file an appeal, even though it already had cost him more than \$3,000 in legal fees.

Notes Shaffner, "We went to court, we lost and we've appealed. Don't get me wrong, I don't really think we're going to win. But even after we've exhausted all of our avenues of appeal, the government still has to collect the \$25. And that isn't going to be easy."

Shaffner says the government will have to put a lien on Dearborn's plant here and even sell it if it is serious about collecting the fine. "It isn't the money," he says, "it's the principle."

Will it really come to that?

"I won't pay it," insists Dearborn. "Someone has to change the system, and I guess that means us."

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I include my Washington Report, entitled "The Defense Budget":

THE DEFENSE BUDGET

A thorough evaluation of our defense needs by the United States Congress is necessary.

Last year the President requested an appropriation of \$105 billion for defense spending, a 15% increase over the previous year. After an extensive review the Congress reduced the request by \$7½ billion, but it only trimmed expenditures in certain categories and it did not stop programs. The Congress often uses this approach in military expenditures, shaving a little bit here and there, stretching out programs—which means that they will cost more in the long run—and cutting funds for operation and maintenance. This year the President is asking for defense expenditures of \$112.7 billion.

The President's view is that every dollar he requests is necessary and that anything less will endanger the security of the nation. He points out that the Soviet military power is growing steadily. (The Central Intelligence Agency has now come to the conclusion that it has been underestimating perhaps by more than 50% the share of Soviet economic resources being devoted to defense.) The President also argues that the burden of defense has declined from more than 9% of national output in 1968 to approximately 6% today. Furthermore, he believes that the United States must now begin to rebuild and modernize its power.

Others disagree with this view. They argue that expenditures for defense during a time of peace should not be more than in a time of war, that the world is safer today than it was ten years ago, and that expenditures for pressing social problems must be made. They also stress the problem of cost overruns on new weapons and wasteful military expenditures, and they contend that the present Armed Forces, though smaller in size, more mobile, pack greater firepower and have greater flexibility than the forces of a decade ago.

In evaluating our defense needs, the Congress knows that the world is still full of dangers and that there are nations which do not wish us well. It also knows that comparing Soviet and American military potential is a somber exercise. Soviet military budgets have been rising by 3% to 5% a year since 1962, while United States military budgets have dropped, or leveled off, since 1968. According to some informed estimates, the Soviets now outspend the United States by about \$40 billion a year on defense. They have 100% more men under arms (4 million compared to 2 million for the United States), four times as many tanks, three times as many submarines, six times the artillery and a stronger air defense. They are building toward equality in strategic forces and their Navy, which is expanding at an impressive rate, is the largest in the world although it is not as versatile as the U.S. fleet. In air power and the sophistication of its nuclear arsenal the United States has a lead.

Other factors have to be considered by the

Congress, too. Not all increases in Soviet spending threaten the United States. Much Soviet military spending is directed toward the internal security of the communist world and the threat the Soviets perceive from China. The Congress should not determine the level of military spending as a percentage of gross national product, but rather by the threat our country faces and by the steps we must take to defend against the threat.

For some time I have felt that the Congress has avoided the tough choices presented by the military budget. The Congress has not really been helping to shape defense posture, but simply reacting to the President's proposals and reducing the resources which he has requested in response to the sharply rising costs of military manpower, sophisticated weapons and the high ratio of support to combat forces.

In evaluating military expenditures, the Congress needs to begin by examining our military commitments. The size and nature of our military force depend, not only on their ability to defend the nation, but also on American foreign policy objectives. Today the United States has mutual defense treaties with some 43 nations and informal commitments to many more. We cannot be the world's policeman and remain committed to defend virtually two-thirds of the world. The United States has vital interests in Europe, the Middle East and Japan, less important interests elsewhere, and our military forces should reflect these interests. This means that the Congress should begin to consider reducing our forces in Asia (we now have 140,000 troops there).

The Congress must also insist that arms control efforts be pursued vigorously. Because the cost of weapons and the risks they create are becoming unsustainable, the superpowers must someday consider, not just arms limitation, but arms reduction.

The Congress must also insist on a lean military establishment. The whole area of defense manpower, military and civilian, needs to be reviewed to eliminate unnecessary or marginally useful jobs. (For example, the student to teacher ratio in military training courses is 2 to 1, and we have a top heavy military today with more three and four star Admirals and more Navy Captains and Colonels than at the height of WW II.)

Finally, in effectively evaluating the defense budget the Congress should assure the existence of a strategic balance with the Soviet Union with secure retaliatory capabilities, but this does not mean that we must match Soviet forces in every aspect of strategic power.

ESTATE TAXATION AND PRESERVATION OF FARMLAND

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, now that hearings are being held on estate taxation legislation before the House Ways and Means Committee, I would like to urge the committee and my colleagues in the House to give favorable consideration to H.R. 3832, the agricultural land estate taxation bill I introduced earlier this year with 55 cosponsors.

The trends in land use in the State of Maryland provide a valuable lesson in the need for this type of legislation. In 1945, 67 percent of the State's land area

was in farms. By 1969 this farm acreage had decreased to 2.8 million acres or 44 percent of the total land area. This is an alarming tendency, and one of the major causes of conversion of farmland has been the archaic Federal estate tax laws.

H.R. 3882 would provide for evaluation of farmland at its present use for estate tax purposes if the farm family decided that they wanted to continue farming. This would considerably reduce Federal estate taxes on most farms since the development or highest use evaluation is almost always higher than the present use evaluation.

Land and our family farms are our most precious resource. Family farms still predominate in this country. For instance, in Maryland, 87 percent of the commercial farms in 1969 were operated as individuals or family organizations. This Congress has a unique opportunity to provide the means for continuing the tradition of passing on family farms from generation to generation. Enactment of H.R. 3882 would establish beyond doubt the interest of the Congress in maintaining the productivity of our farms and in preserving farmlands for future generations. This is a great responsibility which I feel sure the Congress will not ignore.

BUREAUCRATS HAVE BECOME OUR RULERS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, despite the vote in this Congress to kill plans for Federal land use planning, this insidious practice continues in legislative chambers and in our Federal agencies.

An excellent editorial column came across my desk recently in which Mr. Allan C. Brownfeld leveled excellent and enlightening criticism against all manner of "Federal planners." I would like to place that column as it appeared in the February 9 Anaheim Bulletin in the RECORD at this point:

BUREAUCRATS HAVE BECOME OUR RULERS

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

The function of government agencies in our system of checks and balances and division of authority is to administer the laws which the elected representatives of the people in the Congress see fit to enact.

It is not the function of government administrators—bureaucrats—to make laws of their own. They were, after all, not elected by anyone. They do not have to return to voters at stated intervals in elections to receive approval or disapproval. To live in a society in which laws are made by men and women who are not subject to any degree of accountability is to live in a society with unrepresentative government. That is certainly not the system the Constitution meant to establish.

At the present time there are many examples of rule-making by non-elected government officials. The Congress, for example, never passed a law calling for "Affirmative Action" programs in hiring individuals for

college faculty positions—"affirmative action" being, after all, simply a euphemism for racial and sexual quotas. The Congress, in fact, passed the Civil Rights Act of 1964 which specifically bars any form of racial or sexual discrimination—whether on behalf of a particular group or to its detriment. Bureaucrats at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare have, however, "interpreted" this law to mean its opposite. They have, in effect, passed a new law—although they have no legal authority to do so. This, unfortunately, is only one example of the manner in which a system of limited government is on its way to becoming a system of virtually unlimited government.

Bureaucrats are doing more than simply making their own laws. They are, in addition, in the business of using the taxpayers' money to lobby for laws which they feel unable to impose upon us by fiat. An example of this activity is the role being played by the Environmental Protection Agency in pushing as hard as it can for Land Use laws—something the Congress has, thus far, refused to enact, believing such an approach to be a violation of traditional private property rights.

In a study which has just been published, "The EPA and Land Use Controls," journalist Solveig Eggerz discusses this question in some detail. The study, published by the U.S. Industrial Council (918 Stahlman Building, Nashville, Tennessee, 37201) is subtitled: "A Federal Agency's Expansion From Pollution Regulation to Policing Of Private Land Uses."

Miss Eggerz makes a powerful case. Consider several of her examples:

In 1973, Dr. Stanley M. Greenfield, Assistant Administrator of EPA's Office of Research and Monitoring, told an American Society of Planning Officials Conference that, "It would be a shame if EPA were not given a role to play in land use planning."

In its November, 1974 land use policy statement, EPA emphasized the need to coordinate environmental programs and announced EPA's intention to shift from a "pollution abatement mind set to a pollution prevention focus."

EPA's Administrator, Russell Train, testified before the U.S. Senate Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs on behalf of land use bills under consideration. He said that, "It is a matter of urgency that we develop more effective nationwide land use policies and regulations."

An EPA Task Force in 1973 called for a "new land ethic" whereby land is viewed as a resource rather than a commodity, and concluded that EPA needed a land use office and that the nation needed a land use bill. The Task Force called for "a dramatic change in the attitude with which Americans view the land. . . . A new interpretation of the 'taking' clause of the Constitution would be a significant step in realizing a new land ethic. . . . Citizens in this country must adopt the attitude that the land . . . belongs to all mankind—not just to those few who can afford to purchase little pieces for themselves."

Miss Eggerz details the lobbying activities of the EPA in much greater detail. Anyone who reads her study will have little doubt that a government agency created for one purpose—to administer the National Environmental Act and the Noise Control Act—has become, instead, a major lobbying force in behalf of a "new property ethic," which, again, is simply a euphemism for a virtual end to private property rights.

Bureaucrats speak their own euphemistic language—calling racial quotas "affirmative action" and referring to the elimination of private property rights as "a new land ethic"—hoping, as a result, to close the eyes of the public to what they are doing. Too they are successful. Miss Eggerz concludes that, "This is bureaucratism for EPA's intention to involve itself more intensively in

restricting private activities in the interest of the 'public good' . . . EPA has become deeply involved in regulating land use and in promoting land use legislation as an umbrella act to solve the chaos created already by existing environmental legislation."

The fact that private property rights are essential to a free society is something which has been taught to us by history. The Founding Fathers, in 1776, were most seriously concerned about the violation by Great Britain of the property rights of the colonies. As Justice Brandeis has said, freedom is never taken away except for a "good" reason. EPA may have many "good" reasons but the result would, nevertheless, be a contraction of freedom. Beyond this, a government official should carry out laws already passed—not make himself a lobbyist for new legislation he deems worthwhile. Any official who abuses his position in this manner should be removed. All of us would be better off as a result.

THE ENERGY CRISIS AFFECTS EVERYONE

HON. CHRISTOPHER J. DODD

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. DODD. Mr. Speaker, the current energy crisis affects every American in differing degrees. Each one of us has had to readjust our life style to learn to live with limited supplies of energy. However, at the same time the crisis has sparked a great deal of interest in trying to find solutions to our energy shortages. One such individual is Jonathon Pelto of the Mansfield Middle school who has prepared an extensive study of the energy crisis and his ideas on ways to help solve the problem. At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert a portion of Jon's paper that I am sure my colleagues will find interesting:

There have been many sources of energy throughout the ages, from wood to nuclear energy. But now, for the first time, we are going into an energy crisis era.

At the present time we use two different kinds of energy: natural energy and manufactured energy. The natural energy can be broken into two kinds: fossil fuels, which are oil, gas and coal, and non-fossil fuels such as solar energy, wind and geothermal energy. The main type of manufactured energy is nuclear energy. The following is a list of some of the kinds of energies we use, and some of their problems.

Coal: Coal is a fossil fuel and is our most plentiful fossil fuel. We have somewhere between 86 billion and 2 trillion tons left in the U.S. which means that we have between 500 and 700 years of coal left.

Eighteen percent of our total energy consumption is coal. Two-thirds of this is used by the electric companies, and the rest is used by industry. The major reason we don't use much coal is because coal has a major pollution problem. The main source of coal pollution comes in the mining and burning of the coal. Getting coal out of the ground is done by either deep mining or strip mining. Deep mining is unsafe, unhealthy, and it also causes acid drain-off and unstable waste piles. Strip mining is cheaper than deep mining, but causes greater environmental damage and acid drainage which pollutes the water. It also wrecks the land and causes many other environmental problems. The other way coal pollutes is that it gives off many pollutants when it is burned.

At the moment, then, coal cannot be used as a major source of energy. But there are two new ideas being researched to find better ways of using coal. These are gasification and liquefaction. These processes would, for the most part, do the same thing—they turn the coal into a usable gas.

Oil: Another one of the fossil fuels is oil. We have somewhere between 100 billion and 175 billion barrels in the United States which can be pumped. This amount would last somewhere between 20 and 50 years.

We use oil for heating, running our cars and trucks, making plastics and for motor oil.

How oil gets to its place: When the oil is drilled and pumped out of the ground, it is called crude oil. This oil goes to a distillation plant, which heats, vaporizes and separates the oil. Some of the oil is changed into gas, and this is used as cooking gas. Other amounts of gas go to a polymerization plant, which converts the gas into giant molecule compounds. Other gases are made from these molecules, then these gases go to blending tanks. Still other amounts of the crude oil, after going to the distillation plants, is called unrefined gasoline. This also goes to blending tanks. Still another part of the crude oil is called naphtha. It goes to a catalytic reformer, which makes the naphtha into reformed gasoline. This goes to blending tanks too. Other parts of the crude oil go into heavy gas oils. Some of this heavy gas oil goes to a catalytic cracker, and it is made into a catalytic gasoline, and this too goes to blending tanks. Then all the oils that went to blending tanks are mixed, and this produces fuel for jets, diesel fuel for trucks, furnace oil and car gasoline. And the rest of the crude oil is turned into lubricating oils.

Natural Gas: The other major fossil fuel is natural gas. This is a fairly new energy source, but we are already running low. We have somewhere between 1,053,000,000,000,000 and 958,000,000,000,000 cubic feet in the U.S. which will last from 40 to 50 years.

Natural gas is another energy source that has to be drilled. It is used mostly for heating and cooking.

Coal, oil and natural gas, three fossil fuels are our major energy sources. Two of them are going to run out in around 50 years, and one (coal) gives off too much pollution to make it a major energy source.

The following are natural, non-fossil fuel energy sources being looked into now.

Solar energy: Solar energy (energy from the sun) appears to be a very clean source, but current use is very small. Only about 30 houses (test stations) in the U.S. run on solar energy. Solar water heaters are being used in some places around the world. There are about 12 million solar water heaters being used in homes in Japan, South America, and Australia. This source of energy would be a very good source because the earth receives over 200 times as much energy in one day as is needed in the U.S. for a whole year. This means that, if we got all the energy coming to the earth for every day for a year, in that one year alone we would get enough energy to feed all the needs in the U.S. for 73,000 years. This figure would not only heat all the houses but all the factories, too.

The only problem with solar energy is how to store it for cloudy days and use it at night. Research is now going on to find an answer for this problem. Researchers have come up with an idea: massive lead acid storage batteries that could store one million kilowatt hours of electricity or a four-day winter supply for 10,000 homes. The other problem with solar energy is that all of the southwest U.S. would have to be solar collectors to be able to collect enough of the sun's energy.

Wind energy: Another one of the natural,

non-fossil fuels being looked into is wind energy. A committee, jointly appointed by the National Science Foundation and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has suggested that by the year 2000, a development program could result in an annual yield per year of 1.5 trillion kilowatt hours of electricity, the amount of electricity consumed in the U.S. in 1970. Wind power has been used for many centuries, but there has always been one major problem. How do you store the wind? This problem has finally been solved. In a wind-powered home, producing a direct current (DC) power can be stored by charging lead-acid batteries. In a large system the energy can be stored mechanically or hydraulically by pumping water or air into a tank or reservoir, then releasing it later to drive an engine that operates on an electric generator.

Another storage device is a flywheel, which is similar to a spinning top. The fly wheel can be spun by energy from the wind-generated electrical power. The storage is in kinetic energy (motion). A fly wheel is cheaper and more efficient than battery storage which only stores 8-10 watt hours of electricity for each pound of material. A fly wheel can store more than 20 watt hours per second. This is enough electrical power for a week of windless days.

Geothermal energy: Another one of the natural, non-fossil fuels is geothermal energy. This is a low-polluting source of energy. The major problems involve hydrogen sulfide emissions and saline discharges. Geothermal energy is now being used in California. There it is used to produce about 400 megawatts or about 0.1 percent of our present electric power capacity. Although the flow of heat from the middle of the earth is only one-thousandth as much as we get from the sun, the heat accumulated over the past ages is so large that it can be considered limitless. The way geothermal energy is trapped can be divided into three groups: steam-dominated, hot water-dominated, and dry hot rock resources.

PART II. MANUFACTURED ENERGY

The other kind of energy we use is manufactured energy, and the main thing that falls under this category is nuclear energy.

Nuclear energy: This is the most controversial source of energy around, mostly because nuclear energy is feared in most minds because it came in with a bang (to say the least).

In 1940 work began on making an atomic bomb. A team of scientists led by Dr. Glenn T. Seaborg, who was the chairman of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission, started the work. In a couple of years they found that plutonium and U-235 and other elements could be brought together to form a bomb. By the summer of 1945 all the design and industrial problems had been solved. Then on July 16, 1945, our first nuclear weapon was exploded in a test in the desert near Alamogordo in New Mexico. Three weeks later on August 8, 1945, another bomb was dropped on Hiroshima, and then on August 9, 1945, another bomb was dropped on Nagasaki, and this started our nuclear age.

Problems: Nuclear energy has many problems. The major dangers from nuclear energy are radiation and environmental pollution. Not only is radiation connected with cancer, but it also changes chromosomes, so that our offspring will have mutations that can be very dangerous. There are also very large environmental problems, especially thermal pollution from the nuclear plants dumping waste into the water. These bombs are unbelievably powerful. Most normal fires only get a few thousand degrees, but atomic bombs create temperatures of millions of degree temperatures, hot enough to vaporize not only the firemen, but also every piece of fire-fighting equipment.

The three major things that must be done to solve the energy crisis are: (1) We must change from fossil fuels to solar, geothermal and wind power; (2) We must find ways to burn coal without polluting so much, and we must find a way to make nuclear power less dangerous and polluting; (3) The third thing we must do to solve the energy crisis is conserve the fuels we have now. We must have better mass transit and many other things to make the energy last.

One idea to save energy started in Congress as a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to establish on certain public lands of the U.S. national petroleum reserves, the development of which needs to be regulated in a manner consistent with the nation and for other purposes.

This would mean that 300,000 barrels of oil per day of production at the Elk Hills Naval Reserve would be used for every-day gasoline instead of naval reserves. This would reduce our balance of payments to other countries for imported crude oil by about 1.3 billion dollars and save the government about 10 billion dollars per year.

Another very good way to conserve energy is to use and make more mass transportation. People should use more mass transportation to get around, and more funds should go into building better transportation systems in big cities.

We should also have tougher building standards to make houses have better insulation and lighting design. There was a bill on this matter, but it did not pass.

We should also have more carpooling which saves a lot of gas. Another way to save energy is to make a law that auto manufacturers have to make their cars get better mileage. There are also many bills in Congress to help solve the energy crisis like automobile weight tax, carpool deductions, fuel economy tax, insulation deduction, more recycling, a resources and recycling expansion act, mass transportation, a solid waste management act, a homeowner's energy conservation loan act, an energy adjustment act, an energy efficiency labeling act, a national energy emergency policy and conservation act, and many others.

There are many things that you can do to conserve energy:

For lighting: (1) Turn off lights when not using them; (2) Reduce lights in areas where no large light work is done; (a) use smaller bulbs; (b) use a dimmer switch; (3) Don't use gas yard lights; (4) Keep lamps clean; (5) Don't use the inefficient long-life type bulbs; (6) Minimize display and advertising lights and shut down these lights after midnight.

For Heating: (1) Turn down thermostats to 68° F; (2) Insulate walls to 3½" or more; (3) Cut down on air conditioning; (4) Shut off furnace pilots in summer; (5) Weather-strip all homes.

For Water heating: (1) Wash dishes by hand; (2) Minimize use of hot water for washing clothes; try to wash with cold water; (3) Put insulation around hot water lines; (4) Set water heater at 110° F; (5) . . . Install solar hot water heaters . . .

For Transportation: Drive at 55 miles per hour or less.

A MEMORIAL TRIBUTE TO NORMAN PAIGE

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, Norman Paige, a valued friend of many present in this House Chamber, passed

away on Wednesday, March 7, 1976, in Mexico City. The following Monday he was buried in his family home community of Tacoma, Wash. At the time of his death Norman was a distinguished business executive with the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States. Prior to that our friend had a varied career as a thespian, reporter, war correspondent, broadcaster, and businessman.

In his all too short life span of three score years, Norman Paige reflected credit on his every undertaking and on those who were honored to associate with him along the way. His friendship was a privilege of special meaning. His loyalty to the causes in which he believed was unrelenting. He had a patriot's commitment to our Nation and exemplified good citizenship in his daily life. His beloved wife, Marianna, has our sincerest expression of deepest sympathy.

A memorial gathering of some of Norman's Washington-based friends was held at the Capitol Hill Club on Friday, March 12, 1976. Leaders from Government, business, and labor, as well as personal friends, were in attendance. The eulogy was provided by four speakers who had been associated with Norman in various capacities. The encomiums were expressed not in sorrow but in appreciation for the privilege of a valued friendship and a cherished memory. Mr. Speaker, as a part of my remarks today I will include the eulogies in the Record.

The first was by our former colleague in the House of Representatives, the Honorable Harold R. Collier, who presided at the memorial service. Mr. Collier serves as chairman of the Board of Governors of the Capitol Hill Club. As a part of his remarks Mr. Collier said the following:

Ladies and Gentlemen, this is an occasion of sadness because it marks the passing of a good and valued friend.

Yet in memorializing the late Norman Paige, most of us share the kinship of pleasant memories of our association with him—good times—some laughs, and frequently serious conversation.

Thus in our sadness we know that while he left us much sooner than it should have been, he lived a full and interesting life. He had been a stunt man in motion pictures in Hollywood for several years—he was a war correspondent in combat zones during World War II and later worked hard and with great competence in private industry.

Norm Paige was blessed with qualities of character and personality which attracted those around him. He possessed a good sense of humor on one hand and strong convictions in the things he believed.

For these things we shall remember him, yet most important he was blessed with a lovable and totally devoted wife, Marianna.

In saying so long, Norm, we salute you for all of these things and say, "We know that your soul rests in peace."

Mr. Speaker, the second eulogy was by Mr. John Francis Mahoney who is the president of the National Democratic Club and a long time friend of Norman and Marianna Paige. In his remarks Mr. Mahoney commented on Norman's life as follows:

When I first learned of Norman Paige's untimely death, I was reminded of an old prayer, offered, I believe, by St. Francis of Assisi: Lord, That the world might be a little better for my having passed through. Those

of us who were fortunate to know Norman, realize that the world is a little better for his having passed through for he touched each and everyone of us in this room deeply—and individually.

Norm was a man of studied contrasts. He was conservative in temperament, yet his was a genuinely liberal spirit. He was a totally competitive individual, but his was the competitiveness of a gentleman inveighing against the ugly incivilities of life. He used to complain vigorously and regularly about incompetence and stupidity—particularly as they related to the government; still, on a one to one, man to man basis, he was one of the most compassionate men I ever knew.

Norm loved the showmanship of politics and public life. Nonetheless, he despised any sham that degraded a high art form into low burlesque.

There are three dimensions to our lives, as we all know: the past, the present, and the future. So it is in our relation with Norman Paige. We loved and respected him in the past; we miss him today; we will remember him fondly in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the third eulogy was by Mr. Robert W. Coyne who spoke as a distinguished member of the Fellowship Committee of the National Press Club. Mr. Coyne had also a longstanding business association with Mr. Paige. Mr. Coyne remarked as follows:

Good morning, I am Bob Coyne. I have the honor to say a few words on behalf of the Fellowship Committee of the National Press Club of which Norman was a member for many years.

The National Press Club is the most cosmopolitan club in the world and in Norman we had a great cosmopolitan, distinguished in many fields of endeavor—a great newsman, a great foreign correspondent, a great broadcaster, a great advocate—to mention but a few of the fields of his endeavor. Norman crossed many bridges and each one with great distinction. A worshiper of brevity, Norman would wish me to be brief. Norman's crowning accomplishment in his words was the campaign resulting in his marriage to the lovely Marianna. So as I say 'so long' to Norman, may my wishes be simple. May God bless and help us to emulate his great memory. May God bless his lovely wife and may God have mercy on his soul.

Mr. Speaker, the concluding eulogy was given by Mr. Thomas A. Martin, who is a member of the Executive Committee of the Board of Governors of the Capitol Hill Club. Mr. Martin's eulogy pertained to the recent period in Norman's life that was spent in governmental relations work. In memory of Norman Paige, Mr. Martin said the following:

Beloved Marianna and Valued Friends—

It is my privilege to remark briefly on the significance of Norman Paige's professional career during the more recent years of his patriotic, busy, and productive life. I will comment on the period of his executive involvement in governmental affairs.

As Director of Government Relations for the Distilled Spirits Council of the United States, Norman worked in behalf of an industry that is heavily taxed and comprehensively regulated by governments at Federal, state, and local levels. He regularly coped with problems that encompassed all the varied segments of our economy—agriculture, labor, resource development, manufacturing, distribution, and marketing. In the discharge of his demanding responsibilities he dealt with public officials across the governmental spectrum—councilmen, mayors, governors, state legislators, cabinet officers, Members of Congress—even Presidents and other heads of state.

It was the privilege of some of us to work with Norman on mutual causes as he performed his demanding duties. What I say hereafter is based on my personal and rewarding experience of professional association with this staunch friend and steadfast colleague.

Norman abided by the most noble precepts in a daily life that reflected integrity, perceptivity, resourcefulness, judgment, and discretion. A cause had to be meritorious and creditable for him to undertake it. His work was done with effective directness without fanfare; he sought results, not plaudits. He was thorough and scrupulous in marshaling facts; he was convincing in his advocacy which met the highest ethical standard. Norman so conducted his business affairs that he was always more welcome in a place if he had been there before. His character and personal quality, his demeanor and thoughtfulness earned for him the esteem and confidence of all who were privileged to know him. He was demanding of himself and understanding of others.

Norman believed deeply in his Country and in the ethic of human freedom on which our Nation is founded. He believed in the people who constitute our Nation. He lived and worked in a constructive and creative way; his constant goal was to strengthen those things that were good and to rectify those things that were not. As he addressed himself to governmental affairs, Norman proceeded with a motivation that sought to improve the legacy that each day left to the next day and to the future. He was impatient with man's injustices and supportive of causes that promised to foster the brotherhood of mankind.

Norman brought to his responsibilities an abiding confidence that the American private enterprise system was the best economic approach to human freedom, opportunity, and advancement. He understood the responsibility the business community owed to society; but he also comprehended the threat unrestrained government posed for the survival of private enterprise and individual initiative. Thus, we define his commitment to good citizenship on the part of business and good stewardship on the part of government.

The assertion cannot be contested that those of us who have worked with Norman are better qualified people because of our association with him. In a personal sense, we will miss Norman sorely. However, in another and more enduring sense we haven't lost him at all. The challenge of his example, the memory of his friendship, the recognition of his achievements will be with us for all time as our inspiration and incentive. As far as I am concerned when the going is tough, Norman will still be at my side. So for me it's, "Hello, Norman, it's good to be with you again."

Marianna, with you we share the reassurance of an omnipresent love and strength from one who will be with us always through an undeniable and indomitable faith. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Martin's spoken words concluded the eulogy. The assemblage then stood briefly in silent prayer. Mrs. Marianna Paige received the many friends of Norman after the memorial services.

During that memorable Friday morning when so many fine people paid their respects to a wonderful man, I could not help but reflect on how our future will be better and more productive because of our recollections of Norman Paige's worthwhile life, the warmth of his friendship and the high principles which motivated his career. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we will remember Norman Paige and be better Americans because we do.

TRIBUTE TO BECKY MATTHEWS OF MEMPHIS

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I have recently had the opportunity to read an article in the Commercial Appeal newspaper which, in effect, gave overdue recognition to Mrs. Becky Matthews of Memphis for the very outstanding job she has been doing as regent of the Tennessee Society of Daughters of the American Revolution.

Mrs. Matthews has gained a fine reputation as a qualified administrator and promoter of the Tennessee Daughters and they are, indeed, fortunate to have her in such a challenging role of leadership. She has met every challenge given to her and carried out her work in that capacity in a truly outstanding manner.

In addition to working a full time job as vice president of the Barretville Bank and Trust Co., and being a mother to two sons, she has been able to meet the responsibilities of the DAR quite admirably. In recognizing her for the work she has done on behalf of the Daughters of the American Revolution, I would like to take this opportunity to insert the following newspaper article from the Commercial Appeal newspaper:

TRIBUTE TO BECKY MATTHEWS

(By Nickil Elrod)

Becky Matthews has criss-crossed Tennessee so many times in the past two years that she refers to herself as "the Daughter with the traveling bag glued to her wrist."

"I've tried to go wherever they've wanted or needed me," says the regent of the Tennessee Society of Daughters of the American Revolution, known at state and national levels for her amiable, unflappable disposition.

This week, Mrs. Joseph Curtis Matthews of Barretville is presiding at the annual TSDAR conclave, her second of the three-year state regent's tenure. Although some preconference events were scheduled last night and today, the conference officially opens tonight at the Hyatt Regency. It will continue through Saturday.

Always eager to pass the credit along, Mrs. Matthews downplayed her role in conference planning, saying, "The Daughters that have made the plans have really distinguished themselves. It's going to be first-rate."

Among the speakers scheduled are Mrs. Robert L. Jackson of Carlsbad, N.M., who will speak at the official opening session at 8 tonight; Mrs. Ray Wallace Mettetal of Johnson City, Tenn., a national vice president general, national school chairman and immediate past Tennessee regent who will speak at the Youth Breakfast at 7:30 a.m. Saturday; and Mrs. Phyllis Schaffly of Alton, Ill., who will speak at the National Defense Luncheon at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

Mrs. Matthews moved herself into the Regency yesterday although she could easily commute from her sprawling, comfortable country home if she chose.

"Oh, I wouldn't choose," she said, happily thinking of the anticipated visits with longtime friends. "The official events keep DAR strong and growing but it's the afterhours unofficial events that makes DARing fun."

As she organized her personal effects, including the modish Colonial-style gown she will wear at the Chapter Regents Banquet

tonight, and made a final check of her volume of paper work, she reflected on her past 2 years as regent, an accolade to her 27 DAR years.

"Well, of course, I've loved it but I'll admit that I feel a little rushed from time to time. There are some weeks that I barely have time to get unpacked before I'm packing again.

"Like last week, when I was a guest at the Florida conference. Next week I'll be going to Texas and the last week in March, I'll be in Iowa.

"Thank heaven, there will be a couple of weeks after Iowa before the Continental Congress convenes in Washington." (The DAR congress annually convenes the week of April 19, date of the American Revolution's battle of Lexington.)

Mrs. Matthews says the traveling has drawbacks as well as pleasures. "You know that old saying that 'traveling makes you more winsome and wiser.' Let me say, it also makes you fatter. DARs feed you so well, I always have to come home and lose five pounds," she said.

She said she also had to come home to hear her dad, teasingly, threaten to fire her as vice president of Barretville Bank and Trust Co., the bank he founded—"If I don't stay home more."

Mrs. Matthews works full-time in the Peoples State Bank in Millington, a subsidiary of Barretville B&T. "I may have to work out irregular hours to handle my workload, but I get it done," she says.

With the Matthews' sons, Barret, attending medical school, and Paul, in law school, away from home, at-home family responsibilities have slackened some. "But," she said, "there are often painful reminders that I don't give them as much time as I formerly did.

"This past Christmas is the first time in the boys' lives they have ever come home to find the tree not yet up. But if they minded, they didn't let me know. They just got busy and put it up themselves."

Her husband always has been a strong believer in her DAR work, she said. "Joe has been a real strength. And since we have many good friends throughout the state that we enjoy as a couple, when he can spare time from his business (general insurance), he travels with me."

Mrs. Matthews said the Tennessee DAR was in good shape when she became regent. "So my job is simply to keep things together, plan for future growth and stimulate interest in the Bicentennial.

"Our State membership dropped slightly three years ago when national dues went up, but we're regaining ground fast. (Present state membership is about 6,500). Three chapters have been organized since I became regent—the Ephriam McClain in Waynesboro, Alexander McCullar in Munford and the William Cocke in Newport.

"We're especially proud of the Cocke chapter. It was organized by juniors (DARs are junior members until age 35). We are also pleased that we've had a steady increase of juniors in already-organized chapters.

"The Bicentennial observance has done a lot to stimulate interest in DAR work among young women. They have suddenly stopped to realize that our country didn't just jump up full-grown."

She said that most individual chapters have adopted Bicentennial projects such as historical restoration and preservation. "There are Daughters all over the state working to copy old records in county court-houses and churches so they will not be destroyed."

Mrs. Matthews' own Bicentennial project, a prerogative of the regent which requires adoption at state level, is the refurbishing of the Tennessee Room at the DAR museum in Washington. "We have bought a new couch (new is a figure of speech, since any item that goes into the Tennessee Room must be authenticated as pre-dating 1830). In con-

sultations with the museum curator, we are changing the room to make it comparable to a White House room during the Andrew Jackson presidential years. (The finest Andrew Jackson portrait known already is TSDAR property.)"

Mrs. Matthews' own dream is to find a portrait of Rachel Jackson for the Tennessee Room. "I just have to believe one will show up somewhere.

"I got terribly excited last year when a woman from Huntsville, Ala., wrote me that she had a portrait she believed was of Rachel. But after one round of correspondence, I have heard nothing further from her. I plan to contact her again immediately after this conference, with a prayer that it is of Rachel and that it can be authenticated.

"If it doesn't work out, I still have to believe that somebody has Rachel's portrait and will come forward with it."

Mrs. Matthews said that when she was named Tennessee DAR regent, she adopted as a constant companion a poem she had read as a child. "Some days, I have to remind myself two or three times." It reads:

"I am only one, but I am one.
"I can do everything but I can do something.

"What I can do, I ought to do,
"What I ought to do, by the Grace of God, I will."

PENN SOUTH CO-OP RESIDENTS ASSIST THEIR CITY

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, New Yorkers love their city, and in its present fiscal crises they are rallying to its support. One of the most heart-warming examples of the kind of support the city is getting came recently from residents of Penn South, a cooperative housing development in my district.

Penn South, one of the finest co-op developments in the city, is sponsored by the International Ladies Garment Workers Union. Its residents are noted for their civic-mindedness and community spirit, so it was not surprising that Penn South was the first co-op in the city to volunteer to pay its real estate taxes early, without accepting the 8 percent tax discount given to businesses.

A full report on this generous action appeared in the New York Times March 4. I would like to share this report with my colleagues:

[From the New York Times, Mar. 4, 1976]
CO-OP RESIDENTS PREPAY TAXES TO HELP THE CITY

(By Francis X. Clines)

The residents of Penn South Houses yesterday joined the list of those helping the city by paying their real-estate taxes early—but with an altruistic distinction.

The residents, many of them elderly and retired garment workers, not only paid their taxes, but also waived the 8 percent tax discount that various business leaders had been granted as a sweetener by the city as they prepaid taxes and basked in words of civic praise in the last year.

Another important difference was that much of the \$200,000 prepayment offered by the Manhattan housing cooperative came from hardly affluent residents who agreed to pay one month's housing costs early to help the city.

"I'll do all I can for this city," said one of the residents, Bertha Zwerin, who was born in Kiev, Russia, and who has lived here for 60 years. She added:

"My daughter graduated from Hunter College, another daughter went to City College and now my granddaughter's graduating from Juilliard and is getting a job with the Houston Symphony—all because of this city. This is my town. I'll never leave it."

For Michael and Paula Brenner, a handsome gray-haired couple—he had been a dressmaker and she an office worker—the prepayment meant putting up an extra \$199.50 this month in payment of next July's carrying charges.

"We love New York, we love our development," said Mrs. Brenner. "We sit in the midst of New York City at 28th Street and Eighth Avenue, and we wanted to help the city."

Mayor Beame walked over and thanked the residents who, moments earlier, had smiled proudly in a ceremony in City Hall's Blue Room as David Smith, president of the co-op, presented the check to the Mayor. Mr. Smith said that some of the 22 other co-op members of the United Housing Foundation were considering similar help.

The prepayment of taxes by business representatives has been helping the city meet its need for ready cash during the fiscal crisis. Last year, when the crisis forced the city to raise the discount to 8 percent from the traditional 2 percent, \$383.5 million was prepaid, often handed over at news conferences of well-known business leaders.

\$21.4 MILLION LOSS

City officials said that virtually all of them had taken advantage of the 8 percent discount for prepayments. The varying durations of the prepayments meant that the city, while being able to accumulate badly needed cash, also lost \$21.4 million through the discount.

City officials stressed that there was genuine sacrifice on the part of business leaders taking the discount, since some may have aggravated their own cash flow plans to accumulate the payment, or even borrowed at a rate higher than 8 percent to help the city, according to fiscal specialists.

"Until now, it's the co-ops that have been receiving various benefits from the city," said Mr. Smith, who added that there was no fiscal advantage for the co-op in waiving the 8 percent the waiver cost residents \$16,000 and saved the city the same amount.

"Now we're giving rather than receiving," Mr. Smith said.

Mr. Brenner, who retired five years ago at the age of 71, explained that the city, by helping the co-op find the Chelsea site within a short walk of the garment industry, had made it possible to extend his career by six years.

"Not bad," he said, appreciatively. "If I had to keep taking the subway from the Bronx, I wouldn't have been able."

Other favors he currently counted from the city included his hours of daily reading at the Bryant Park library and his wife's regular trips to Lincoln Center.

"My granddaughter, Robin Graham, has played at Lincoln Center," Mrs. Zwerin chimed in.

To meet the prepayment, 1,200 of the co-op's 3,000 residents advanced a month's charges. The co-op, which costs about \$40 a room each month, plus utilities, is about 50 percent occupied by retired persons, Mr. Smith said.

After all the months of heated, often accusatory confrontation at City Hall over the fiscal crisis, the visit from the old people was clearly welcomed by the Mayor.

"It's a sacrifice," said Elmer Epstein, a retired laundry union worker, "but the city is sacrificing much worse."

ENCOURAGING SIGNS FOR REREFINING OF WASTE LUBRICATING OIL

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, as many of my colleagues are aware, for over 5 years I have worked for the establishment of a national program to encourage the recycling of waste lubricating oil. Since 1971, I have sponsored the National Oil Recycling Act which removes the serious Federal tax and regulatory disincentives to the recycling of waste lubricating oil.

The following article, which appeared in last Thursday's newspaper, details how the economic climate for refining lubricating oil has improved. But the article goes on to point out that there are several major impediments to continued progress in rerefining waste oil. These problem areas include:

First, current Federal Trade Commission regulations on the labeling of rerefined oil;

Second, excise tax policies which discourage the use of rerefined oil;

Third, the environmentally hazardous policy of burning untreated waste oil as fuel oil, and

Fourth, lingering doubts about the quality of rerefined oil.

I am hopeful that some of these problems will be resolved through a program of research and testing of rerefined oil by the National Bureau of Standards. Under the Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975—Public Law 94-163—the NBS was directed to devise test standards to determine the quality of rerefined oil relative to new oil. These test procedures should help resolve finally the question of the quality of rerefined oil and lead to a satisfactory resolution of the controversy over labeling rerefined oil.

For the interest of my colleagues, I am submitting the article on rerefined oil to the RECORD. The article follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal, Mar. 11, 1976]

EXPENSIVE OIL, ENVIRONMENTAL MOVEMENT PROVE BOONS TO THE RE-REFINING INDUSTRY

(By James Carberry)

The oil re-refining industry is getting a boost from widespread efforts to reduce the high cost of oil and protect the environment.

About 2.4 billion gallons of lubricating oil are sold annually in the U.S. for use in industrial machinery and in cars, trucks, planes and other vehicles. Only about half of it is actually consumed in the lubricating process; some 1.2 billion gallons of waste oil are drained annually from those machines and vehicles and replaced with new oil.

By far the biggest use of this waste oil today is as a supplement to fuel oil; roughly half of the waste oil is used for this purpose, primarily by utilities and industry. Waste oil sells for around 10 cents a gallon less than fuel oil in some markets, so a company that burns a million gallons of it a year saves \$100,000. (Waste oil can't completely replace fuel oil because there is so little of it available compared with the billions of gallons of fuel oil used annually.)

Once it is burned, waste oil is lost forever

as a resource. And the re-refining industry is trying to convince people that a better use would be to re-refine more of it for re-use as a lubricant. Re-refining is the removal of dirt, gasoline, lead and other contaminants from waste oil and the insertion of additives, such as corrosion inhibitors, to improve its performance. Re-refining employs a technology different from that of oil refineries, which don't process waste oil because some of the contaminants could foul up refinery operations.

SOME REASONS

Now, less than 10% of the waste oil is re-refined—about 110 million gallons last year—compared with the nearly 50% used for fuel. Another 18% or so is used for road oil and in asphalt. The rest presumably is dumped on land or in sewer systems.

Why is so little oil re-refined? For one thing, poor-quality oil was turned out by some re-refiners in the past, and that has scared off some potential buyers. The federal government, for example, refuses to use re-refined oil in its military or civilian vehicles. For another, sales of re-refined oil have been discouraged by federal policies on its taxation and labeling. Also, the scavenging companies that buy waste oil from service stations, car dealers, airports and other sources sell a lot of it to fuel-oil users, who generally have been able to pay more for it than re-refiners.

As a result of all this, some re-refiners haven't been able to obtain adequate supplies of waste oil or to drum up enough business. In the past 15 years or so, the number of U.S. re-refiners has dwindled to around 45 from 150.

But the surviving companies did around \$134 million worth of business last year and are optimistic about the future. So are some independent observers. A study by Frost & Sullivan Inc., a New York market research firm, forecasts that by 1985, about 1.4 billion gallons of waste oil will be generated annually, and 60% of it will be re-refined. That would mean 840 million gallons of re-refined oil a year, almost an eightfold increase. "The growth in re-refined lubricating oil," the study says, "will be at the expense of waste oil used as a fuel" and in other applications.

One reason for this bullish outlook: Prices of lubricating oils have increased as much as 100% in the past two years, and this has increased the demand for re-refined oil. "Our business is growing considerably," says Belton Williams, president of Motor Oils Refining Co., a re-refiner near Lyons, Ill. Mr. Williams says his company sells re-refined oil for 10% to 25% less than new lube oils. One of its customers is Burlington Northern Inc., a railroad company, which uses about a million gallons of re-refined oil annually. Some of it is purchased from Motor Oils; the rest is re-refined by Burlington in its own plant.

IMPACT OF POLLUTION RULES

Another reason for the bullish outlook has to do with the environment. To meet air-pollution regulations, some fuel-oil users face the expense of buying equipment that prevents lead and other contaminants from escaping into the air when waste oil is burned. In some cases, it will be cheaper simply to burn fuel oil. That is expected to dampen some of the demand for waste oil as a fuel, and make it easier for re-refiners to compete for waste-oil supplies.

The environmental movement is spurring the re-refining industry in another way. Partly because waste-oil collection services aren't available throughout the U.S., about 22% of the waste oil generated yearly, or 260 million gallons, isn't collected. Studies in 1974 by the Environmental Protection Agency suggest it is probably dumped in sanitary landfills or down sewer systems. Some of it finds its way into underground

water tables or rivers, lakes and, ultimately, the oceans.

Concerned that water pollution may result from such haphazard disposal practices, localities such as Sunnyvale, Calif., and Chittenden County, Vt., have initiated programs for the systematic collection and re-refining of waste oil. In Minnesota, about 50 of Continental Oil Co.'s FasGas self-service stations accept waste oil from people who change their own oil. (The stations themselves don't change oil). The stations sell the waste oil to scavengers for three cents a gallon and donate the proceeds to charities. The scavengers, in turn, sell some of the waste oil to re-refiners. The program was initiated last year at the request of Minnesota's Pollution Control Agency. And in Wisconsin, legislation has been drafted that would encourage waste-oil recycling.

While such efforts have given the re-refining industry a shot in the arm, re-refiners still face obstacles in the marketing of their products.

TAX TREATMENT

One obstacle is the complicated tax treatment of lubricating oils. A six-cent-a-gallon federal excise tax is included in the sale price of new, or virgin, lube oil (there isn't such a tax on refined oil), but the consumer can get a refund of the tax from the government if the oil is used for something other than highway driving such as farming. However, if the consumer buys a blend of, say, 50% virgin oil and 50% re-refined oil, he pays a tax based on the percentage of virgin oil in the blend—three cents a gallon in this instance—and can't get a refund. Re-refiners say that this has hurt their sales of blended oils for non-highway uses, a significant part of their market, by effectively raising their price. Bills have been introduced in Congress to change this, but nothing has come of them.

Another problem is that the Federal Trade Commission requires containers of refined oil to be labeled "Made from previously used oils." Re-refiners say that this unfairly brands their product as inferior and has cost them sales. An FTC official says: "Our position is that we will re-examine this requirement when it can be shown that re-refined oil is equivalent to virgin oil."

And that raises perhaps the thorniest problem of all: How can re-refiners prove their claims that they consistently turn out a product just as good as virgin oil?

It is generally agreed that the best way is to subject re-refined oil to some commonly accepted quality-control tests. But there are differences between those inside and outside the re-refining industry over what tests should be used. Should the tests be the same as those used to determine the quality of virgin lube oils? Or are more stringent tests required? Or would less stringent tests suffice? Unless such questions are resolved, re-refined products aren't expected to win widespread acceptance in some markets, such as the huge market for motor-vehicle lube oils.

There are indications that the problem is receiving sympathetic consideration in Washington. The Energy Policy and Conservation Act signed by President Ford last December directs the National Bureau of Standards to develop test procedures for comparing re-refined oil and virgin oil. The bureau will submit its recommendations to the Federal Trade Commission, which will prescribe test standards and labeling requirements for re-refined oil.

As proof that their product is as good as new, re-refiners note that many of their customers have been using it for years. A Midwest railroad—a spokesman asks that it not be identified—has been using some re-refined oil in its diesel engines for about eight years; it says this has cut its lube-oil bill by about \$120,000 a year. In Chicago, Flash Cab Co. says it has been using re-refined oil in its

fleet for about 20 years. And in Houston, Billups Western Petroleum Co. has been marketing a re-refined oil for motorists for five years; the price now is 41 cents a quart, compared with a current range of 46 cents to 74 cents a quart for the firm's new tube oils.

RECENT DEATH OF MRS. ANNIE DE CHABERT CLARKE

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues the recent death of Mrs. Annie de Chabert Clarke on January 12, 1976, in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands.

"Miss Annie," as she was affectionately called, was widely known throughout the Virgin Islands as a leading business and political figure. Always active in civic and political organizations, she was for several years the Democratic national committeewoman from the Virgin Islands, vice president of the Red Cross, a member of the social welfare board and the board of education, the Professional Women's Club, and the League of Women Voters.

Because her accomplishments were so notable and her achievements so praiseworthy, I am inserting in the RECORD the funeral eulogy delivered by the Honorable Almeric Christian, chief judge of the Virgin Islands District Court which eloquently pays honor to this outstanding woman:

EULOGY DELIVERED ON THE OCCASION OF THE BURIAL OF MRS. ANSETTA ELENA DE CHABERT CLARKE

There must have been a very special celebration in the modest Muckle household in Christiansted, incidentally, not too far from this church, just around the corner, on Smith's Street, on the anniversary of the birth of the great liberator, Abraham Lincoln, in February of 1908, for the day before a baby girl had been born to Ernest Muckle and Sarah, born Jeffers, and they named the infant Ansetta Elena. Today, 67 years 11 months and some five days later a heavy pall of sadness envelopes the length and breadth of the Virgin Islands as we lay that child to rest in death.

My high honor and privilege this afternoon is to, in my imperfect and woefully inadequate way, pay homage to the life lived by this extraordinary person, as she coursed the trail of all flesh, from birth to death. Time and my unsufficing capability makes impossible a full and complete logging of that voyage, and to what purpose would be the exercise. The litany is too long and too well known for meaningful rehearsal. Yet the occasion demands that at least in a fleeting glance, we call to mind a few of the sandy summits on which the remarkable footprints of this woman of distinction are so indelibly imbedded.

Child of an energetic father, his influence strongly decreed the person she was to be. In him was the happy combination of fisherman and merchant—following both pursuits out of watergut in this very town, he would go out to haul his pots before dawn, return to sell his catch in the morning, and tend his family-type store known as "the Little Red Shop" in the afternoon and early evening.

From early childhood young Ansetta was at his side in the shop. Not even the natural

childhood inclination for play with brothers and sisters, (not necessarily listed in proper chronological sequence) Ena, Iantha, Axel Casmus, Alfredo, Berhardt, Eneca and Julia, could keep her away. Eager to learn, intelligent and energetic, she in short order mastered the rudiments and vagaries of business. Not surprisingly then from her earliest teens she was placed by her dad in full charge of "the Little Red Shop"—when school did not dictate otherwise—as he plied his fisher's trade in the first half of the day.

In acknowledgment of the love and respect showered on her by father and customers in the store, an appropriate form of address was fashioned for the bright-eyed little moppet, they little knowing, at the time, that this was the name by which she would become known in virtually every Virgin Island household. Fondly they dubbed her "Miss Annie". Even her parents so addressed her.

Among those first to own a Model T Ford on this island in the 1920's, Ernest Muckle added that of itinerant merchant to his activities. As often as possible Miss Annie would accompany him as he sold his wares from estate to estate. Thus was the opportunity presented for Miss Annie to learn to know, appreciate, and love her people—and they her. The contacts which would later stand her in such good stead, were early made.

In the same decade this vivacious young woman on the move caught the eye and fancy of an equally electrifying and already distinguished native son, Ralph De Chabert. Wooing and winning followed, and on July 18, 1929, Mr. Ralph and Miss Annie, monikers by which they were thereafter known, formed a partnership, cemented by holy wedlock, which was to last some 36 years, cut off as it was on the rise to its zenith by the great leveller. All his talent and accomplishment, notwithstanding, Mr. Ralph was a quiet, reticent man, qualities which, more for good than ill, never rubbed off on Miss Annie—and so the one complemented the other.

This marriage was blessed with five offspring, all now in respectable adulthood, Ralph Andrew, Austin Alexander, Rita May, Mario Norman and Shirley Joyce. So first and foremost we mark Miss Annie as loving and devoted—child, wife, and mother.

As a businesswoman, few, if any, are her peers. From the little red shop and itinerant merchant—and as she journeyed about in the model-T, who can doubt that she valiantly cranked it up a few times—or at least set the sparks and gas as her daddy cranked. On her own came first the King Street store "De Chabert Fashions". Here she was owner, manager, sales lady and seamstress—sold the material—made the dress—characteristically, she got you both ways—coming and going. Next the family ventured into dairy farming and livestock raising—in the beginning the 35 acre farm at Rosegate then the many times over larger acreage at "Hope", "Jerusalem" and "Blessing".

Miss Annie's 47th birthday was an unhappy one, for five days earlier death had reached out and snatched her Ralph from her. Undaunted she persevered. The children were educated, now to the benefit of the community, doctor, lawyer, educators, business persons. The farm prospered. Came the venture into real estate sale and development, Miss Annie holding off when the time was not ripe, seizing the propitious moment and parlaying the holdings into a seven-digit fortune and giving the territory the stability of oil refineries and our first shopping center.

A feminist to the core. In an age where in this insular setting women, like children, were to be little seen and never heard, she broke the barriers of sight and sound in ways more than one. She championed women's rights, not by flaming rhetoric but rather by accomplishments. She was indefatigably

active in BPW Club and League of Women Voters.

In the sector of public health, who labored more assiduously, or journeyed wider for the American Red Cross, the St. Croix Community Blood Bank as charter member, the Caribbean Mental Health Association, and the Charles Harwood Hospital Auxiliary.

In the forefront always in government with special effort on the Board of Education, Board of Social Welfare, and The Citizen's Rehabilitation Commission.

In politics she etched out an especial niche. For many years the heart and soul of the Democratic Party. Who would launch a candidacy without her blessing—not to mention financial contributions—party fund raiser beyond compare—as all upon whom she has put "The Bite" from time to time will attest. V.I. National Committee Woman and convention delegate she walked with the Presidents, near Presidents and other luminaries on the national democratic scene—yet never lost "The Common Touch".

Communicant of this church—active in all spheres consoler, stand-in at ceremonies, donor, landscaper—all of which lead naturally into her second marriage at this same altar—on November 14, 1971, to the Reverend L. Seymour Clarke—rector (I add par excellence) of this church—whom she leaves with us to mourn her passing.

But why go on—as well I could. Miss Annie will long be remembered for more than these matters I've touched on.

Frail human, she was not without taint of fault, and there may be those who on this count only will remember her. To them, if any, I answer with Tennyson,

But friend, to me
He is all fault who hath no fault at all
For who loves me
Must have a touch of earth.

So she had her touch of earth—but on the other side of the ledger she was heavy.

All heart—charitable to a fault. Students assisted. A loan here forgiven. A palm there, coming away from a hand shake with a needed crisp bill nestled in. Considerate of the poor for which she has been, it is evident, blest.

An indomitable will reaching and infusing family friend alike. Not the least bit faint hearted hence fortune sided with her. Unafraid to beat new paths. A guiding principle of her life being who never walks save where he sees men's tracks, makes no discoveries.

Always exemplifying the basics: Hard work and love—a deep love, conceived in faith, ever nurtured by hope.

Not really "born to the purpose" she "bent ulysses' bow" as the saying goes.

For her many virtues a crown to two husbands. And if, as has been said, one "cannot leave a better legacy to the world than a well educated family" her bequest can hardly be surpassed.

So as she sleeps in beauty—a sleep the common fate of us all, though the loss be irreplaceable, and the sorrow profound, let the tears be few, for Miss Annie "like the sun in its meridian [has] spread [s] a lustre throughout [that envelops] and enlightens" this entire corner of the universe. We will all often long for the touch of that vanished hand—for the sound of this so familiar voice, now still.

As we salute the triumph of her life over death, we remember the words of the Bard of Avon.

Thou art not conquered;
Beauty's ensign yet
Is crimson in thy lips,
And in thy cheeks,
And death's pale flag is not advanced
there.

So Miss Annie 'Til we chat again—a fond adieu.

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN DAMS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my opposition to the construction of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric dams in northern Maine remains constant and insistent.

I have attempted to get the facts on the proposed project on the record before my colleagues. To that end, I would like to insert in the Record at this time an excellent article, the second of a three-part series, written by Janice Snow, for the February 1976 edition of New England Outdoors. I commend it to my colleagues:

THE DICKEY-LINCOLN DAMS—MONEY BUYS POWER, BUT HOW MUCH POWER WILL OUR MONEY BUY?

(By Janice Snow)

Last May we printed the first of three articles dealing with the proposed Dickey and Lincoln School Dams, a multimillion dollar public works project slated to inundate 89,000 acres of Northern Maine wilderness. The larger of the two dams will exceed in volume the Aswan Dam (11th largest in the world) and create a 57 mile long lake of two-thirds of the free-flowing Upper St. John River. One hundred and twenty four miles of lesser known rivers and streams will also be flooded.

The project's designers, the Army Corps of Engineers, expect the construction to span 7½ years, provide flood control for the town of Fort Kent, generate base electric power for Maine and peaking power for Southern New England, reduce unemployment in Maine, encourage the flow of development capital to shore up Maine's sagging economy and save New England's taxpayers money in the process.

The value and necessity of this essentially hydroelectric power facility (95% of the projects claimed benefits are power benefits) have been hotly disputed. As we detailed in our May issue, environmentalists have been the most vocal opponents. The Friends of the St. John (a coalition of environmental and outdoor sportsmen's groups) decries the loss of the "most outstanding stretches of wilderness river east of the Mississippi . . . graced with forested banks and some of the country's best native brook trout fishing . . . habitat of white tailed deer, moose and bald eagles."

The Army Corps of Engineers expects to provide a "recreational master plan" to make the man-made lakes region more accessible, more convenient and thus increase recreational use and land development.

Although an environmental impact statement must be submitted before the project can be approved by Congress, the decision to build or not to build will most likely be decided on the real or imagined economic merits of the project.

A detailed analysis of the process of computing the cost and benefits is essential to obtain any realistic assessment of the project's economic worth. The methods of determining these economic benefits are complex, confusing and deceptive.

The Army Corps of Engineers not only proposes, designs and oversees construction of such mammoth public works projects, they also hire the private consultants who determine the projects' economic feasibility and environmental impact—an obvious conflict of interest. The size and prestige of the Corps increases with the scope and duration

of such projects, thus magnifying the possibility of biased accounting.

According to the Corps' most recently published cost analysis (July 1975), the "benefits" to be derived from the Dickey-Lincoln Lakes outweigh the "costs" by 2.6 to 1. Does this mean that for every dollar spent, New England taxpayers will receive a \$2.60 return on their investment in the form of cheaper energy, lower taxes or both? No.

The Corps has also released a study of the cost of Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power compared to privately produced fossil fuel power. Here the Corps report claims a 2.0 to 1 ratio in favor of Dickey-Lincoln Lakes. "If private utilities could obtain financing equivalent to the Federal rate," the report states, "water resource benefits could be provided at half the cost of the private utility alternative." Does this mean that Dickey-Lincoln electricity will cost 50% less than Boston Edison electricity? No. Is the Army Corps of Engineers lying to us? No. Are they telling us the truth? Not exactly.

What will the project cost? According to the July 1975 Army Corps of Engineers Dickey-Lincoln Lakes Fact Sheet, the total investment for dams and transmission lines (computed at 1975 prices) and including interest during construction totals \$539.8 million. This figure reflects a \$75.6 million write off, as the Army Corps expects to recoup 50% of the \$151.3 million cost of construction and maintenance of the transmission lines by selling transmission or "wheeling rights" to private power companies. The validity of this deduction is highly questionable. According to Corps officials, the Dickey-Lincoln site is one of the last available hydroelectric power sites in New England, thus we cannot expect additional private dams to be built. Northern Maine is now and no doubt will continue to be sparsely populated. It would not make economic sense to build conventional power plants in Northern Maine and pay to "wheel" the electricity along costly transmission lines across hundreds of miles of wilderness when such facilities could be built closer to population centers. If we add this highly questionable deduction back into the project cost, the figure approaches \$615.4 million. But, this estimate assumes no further transmission costs for tying into existing lines at Augusta, Maine, or the more expensive possibility that existing lines from Maine to Boston may be at capacity in the late 1980s when the dam is completed. If this is the case, then hundreds of additional miles of costly transmission lines will have to be constructed at the taxpayer's expense.

Even if low cost tie-in lines are available, the \$616.6 million figure does not accurately reflect the real cost of the project. In order to acquire capital to finance such an enormous project, the Army Corps of Engineers must be authorized to borrow money from the U.S. Treasury. This money is then paid back over a period of years at a fixed interest rate. Electricity sales must generate sufficient income to pay the annual mortgage fee plus operating expenses.

The Corps calculates the annual cost of paying back the loan on the dams and 50% of the transmission lines to be \$18.3 million based on an interest rate of 3¼% paid over a period of 100 years. The U.S. Department of Interior sets repayment criteria for all Federal water resource projects. The current rate is 6¼% paid over a period of 50 years. The current repayment criteria will no doubt increase as the 1974 Water Resources Development Act provides for a 6¼% interest rate for water resource planning. A grandfather clause in the '74 Act, included at the insistence of the powerful water lobby, allows projects proposed before 1968 to be evaluated at the old rate of 3¼%. The Corps figures are then legal, but false. The actual, annual rate of paying back the loan is

approximately double the stated rate upon which they base the 2.6 to 1 benefit to cost ratio.

The annual cost of repaying the loans to build and operate both the Dickey and Lincoln School Dams and 100% of the transmission lines from Dickey to Augusta exceeds \$44 million. The Corps report admits on page 7 of their 12 page fact sheet, that as "a point of interest, if the project were evaluated on a 6¼% interest rate, it remains justified with a 1.3 to 1 ratio." Yet the only table which computes the annual benefit to cost ratio makes no note of the actual repayment interest and offers only the 2.6 to 1 ratio. One might question the use of taxpayers money on such involved tabulations, obviously calculated to get certain projects approved at any cost and at a real cost carefully concealed from notice.

The Fact Sheet claims annual benefits derived from the project to be in excess of \$55 million. Of this amount, \$52.8 million are projected power benefits (income from the sale of Dickey-Lincoln electricity). The remaining \$2.2 million are "non-power benefits"—\$77,000 in flood control, \$1.25 million in recreation and \$983,000 in redevelopment. The flood control figure is based on the cost of two flood control dikes which would be required to protect Fort Kent if the Dams are not built. No mention is made however of the five flood control dikes which must be built to prevent the new lakes from spilling over into adjacent watersheds.

"Redevelopment benefits" are merely the annual wages paid to unemployed or underemployed local residents. Only 30% of the total Dickey-Lincoln work force (approximately 550 unskilled and semiskilled workers) can be drawn from the Fort Kent area. The permanent loss of logging jobs due to the flooding of 140 square miles of timberland will offset some of these temporary gains in employment. The remaining 60% of the labor force, all the highly paid skilled workers and many of the semi-skilled workers must be imported. Nearby Canadians can be expected to fill many of these positions. Harsh Maine winters may reduce the work year to five or six months, leaving hundreds of locals and transients jobless during the most difficult months. The local economy, swollen by the influx of new wages will suffer regular deflations during the long winter lay-off periods and a sharp decline at the completion of the eight to ten year construction period. Of the nearly 1600 workers, only about 35 will be assured long term jobs maintaining and operating the Dickey-Lincoln facility.

The "recreational benefits" reflect the Corps of Engineers assumption that the man-made lakes environment will draw an additional 1.2 million tourist dollars to this "improved" recreation area each year. The numerous uncongested natural lake vacation areas in Southern Maine, Northern New Hampshire and Vermont may discourage any large migrations farther north.

Although the projected "recreational", "redevelopment", and "flood control benefits" inflate the estimated value of the project, the cost of producing these services are "non-reimbursable". In other words, the rates charged for Dickey-Lincoln electricity will not repay the money expended for these "non power benefits." The taxpayers will foot the bill.

The "power benefit" figure, the last measure of the project's economic feasibility, like the 3¼% interest rate, has only paper significance. If Dickey-Lincoln electricity sold at the same rate as electricity from a privately financed fossil fuel plant yearly income ("power benefits") would total \$52.8 million per year (at 1975 rates).

Calculating the annual "benefits to cost ratio" strictly on the Corps of Engineers

estimated annual cost of construction and operation, paid back at 6% interest (\$44.3 million) in relation to these claimed power benefits (\$52.8 million) yields a slim 1.17:1 benefit to cost ratio. But if Dickey-Lincoln is to provide the promised reductions in electrical rates, this slim margin of profit will disappear. Rate reductions of only 18% will put the project in the red.

Might not the possibility of another fuel shortage, the need to conserve diminishing fossil fuel supplies, and the inevitable increases in fuel prices justify this investment in hydroelectric power? Perhaps, if the only energy alternative to Dickey-Lincoln were fossil fuel plants, and the current energy policy remained unchanged, the project could eventually operate in the black.

The law (Senate Docket No. 97) requires the Army Corps of Engineers to prove the economy of its hydroelectric power projects over the least costly alternative. As no large scale public power facilities exist in New England, the comparison has been limited to a privately financed pumped storage and gas turbine facility. More economical and ecological Federally financed power possibilities escape consideration.

Dickey-Lincoln is primarily a peaking power facility, designed to produce large amounts of electricity during hours of greatest demand. Although the kilowatt output is high, the operating periods are brief—2½ to 5 hours per day, depending on seasonal water levels. Expensive turbines will remain idle about 80% of the time. All peaking power facilities are expensive. A gas turbine facility operating a few hours a day consumes 25% more fuel than a steady or base power facility, which operates 12 to 14 hours per day.

The New England Regional Commission, recognizing the need to conserve energy, has recommended to the New England Governor's Council that New England electric rates should be "revised" to discourage "peak time/peak season consumption and help to level demand load through reduction of peak demands, thus promoting more efficient operation of power generating facilities." If the peaks level out as the Commission proposes there may be no market for 85% of Dickey-Lincoln's capacity. Seasonal dry spells and an uneven flow make the Upper St. John River unsuitable for a large scale base power facility.

If energy consumption patterns remain stable, Dickey-Lincoln would provide an estimated 10% of New England's peaking power, but less than 1% of New England's total electrical needs in the 1980s. The amount of development capital required to build a facility, which may be outmoded before it is completed will exceed (assuming a modest 7% rate of inflation) \$1 billion.

A billion dollars in investment capital wisely invested in energy conservation and new energy technology could save many times the energy an enormous hydroelectric peaking power dam could produce. The "Summary of Scope of Work—Environmental Impact Statement for the Dickey Lincoln Lakes project" prepared for the Corps of Engineers by Metasystems lists on p. 32 of a 45 page report some possible energy alternatives to Dickey-Lincoln: "combined cycle gas turbine and steam generating plants recovering up to 40% of the heat lost in burning, total energy systems integrating power generation with heating and cooling systems, fuel cells and solid waste burning." Dickey-Lincoln will cost 20 times as much as a garbage power plant currently under construction in Saugus, Mass., yet will produce less than three times the energy.

R. Buckminster Fuller, in the introduction to *Earth, Energy, and Everyone* (Medard Gable with the World Game Energy Report, 1975) states, "an inventory of daily income, [renewable] energy resources, proven know-how technologies, and proven rates of reali-

zation of the full complex of developments" indicates adequate non-fossil fuel production can be accomplished by 1985.

The New England Regional Commission recommends public financial assistance to develop such new income energy technologies as solar heating systems, windmill power generators and heat pumps.

It makes little long-term economic sense to pour a billion dollars of development capital into the last feasible hydroelectric power site in New England, when that same money could generate new energy producing and energy saving technology. Comparable investments in home and industrial insulation, mass transit, and improved rail freight service and recycling of waste heat and raw materials would have two to ten times the energy produced by a mammoth, environmentally damaging hydroelectric or nuclear power facility.

THE SILENT PARTNER OF HOWARD HUGHES—PART VIII

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today I am inserting the eighth installment of the Philadelphia Inquirer's exposé regarding Howard Hughes' privileged relationship with sectors of the U.S. Government. In this segment, reporters Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele outline Howard Hughes' influence with American politicians over the last 30 years.

The article follows:

HOWARD HUGHES: NONVOTER AND KING MAKER

"Bob, you must remember that . . . I, Howard Hughes, can buy any man in the world, or I can destroy him."—Attributed to Hughes by former aid Robert Maheu.

(By Donald L. Barlett and James B. Steele)

If there is a constant that has governed Howard R. Hughes in the bizarre and mysterious administration of his secret empire, it is his abiding faith in the power of political influence.

During World War II, Hughes—whose Trans World Airlines was seeking permission from the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB) for exclusive rights to fly to certain European cities—flew Elliott Roosevelt, the President's son, and his bride-to-be to the Grand Canyon, gratis, for their wedding.

In the 1960s, Hughes, a leading defense contractor, financed airborne coyote hunts in Texas for Pentagon brass who hunted their prey in Hughes supplied helicopters and cars.

In 1968, the Hughes organization pledged a substantial contribution to Richard M. Nixon's campaign shortly before it sought an exemption from the anti-trust laws to acquire an additional Las Vegas hotel and gambling casino.

Such practices have served Howard Hughes well in Washington.

The CAB granted TWA's request for exclusive overseas routes in 1945.

The Pentagon has consistently awarded Hughes hundreds of millions of dollars in defense contracts without competitive bidding.

And the Justice Department, in a dramatic turnaround just three days before Nixon's 1969 inauguration, agreed not to oppose Hughes' proposed acquisition of the Landmark, a Las Vegas hotel and casino.

Only 28 days before, the same Justice De-

partment had informed Hughes' attorneys of the reverse—that the government intended to oppose in court any attempt by Hughes to acquire the Landmark on the ground that such a move would violate the antitrust laws.

As The Inquirer has previously disclosed, the Hughes organization collects and spends billions of American tax dollars without any public accountability. Hughes is shielded and protected by a variety of federal agencies in Washington from the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) to the Civil Aeronautics Board.

Howard Hughes never votes, but he exercises more power over American government than all but a few of the Americans who do.

Hughes now-famous secret contributions to former President Nixon's campaign might seem to suggest an affinity on Hughes' part for the policies of the former President.

But actually, Hughes has an affinity for any politician either in office or likely to be so soon. He has long given lavishly to both major parties. He has sought to influence every administration since Franklin D. Roosevelt's. Often, he has succeeded, sometimes stunningly so.

In 1947, a Senate Committee investigated Hughes' entertainment of high Roosevelt officials during the war, including Elliott Roosevelt, as part of its probe of Hughes' performance as a major defense contractor in World War II.

The committee interviewed witnesses who claimed that Hughes, then an active movie-maker as well, often stocked Hollywood parties with movie stars and actresses to mingle with high government officials and military brass.

Elliott Roosevelt, who as an Army reconnaissance officer during the war had recommended that Hughes be awarded a contract to build a new Army reconnaissance plane, admitted to senators that Hughes had once paid his hotel bill. It was in those hearings that Roosevelt acknowledged that Hughes had, at no charge, flown him and Faye Emerson, the actress, to Arizona for their wedding near the Grand Canyon.

Roosevelt was also accused of having accepted other favors from Hughes. A Hughes public relations officer's expense account, which was read into the record of the Senate hearings, listed such items on Roosevelt's behalf as "presents for four girls, \$200."

By the 1950s, Hughes was leaving such details as entertaining politicians and government leaders to other men in his empire.

He relied heavily on Robert Maheu, a private public relations consultant and former FBI agent, to represent him in Washington. Maheu became one of the most powerful men in the Hughes realm before his fall from power in 1970.

In 1956, according to Maheu's testimony in a defamation lawsuit he filed against Hughes in Los Angeles, Hughes "picked up the price tag for a good portion of (a) poll" conducted during the Republican campaign that year.

Maheu added that he himself took an active part in Eisenhower's 1957 inaugural and made it known to dignitaries that he represented Hughes.

When John F. Kennedy was elected President in 1960, Hughes asked Maheu to host an airplane for entertainers from Los Angeles to Washington to take part in the Kennedy inaugural, Maheu also testified.

Maheu said Hughes also instructed him to purchase four boxes, at \$10,000 each, for the Kennedy inauguration; to purchase additional boxes for the inaugural ball, and to hold a "banquet at the then most famous restaurant in Washington" as his personal representative.

By then, early in 1961, Howard Hughes had of course, already slipped out of public view. But his presence was felt from the opening days of the Kennedy Administration.

Not long after the new Democratic regime had taken office, Hughes sought to cement his

ties with it even more firmly. As Maheu testified:

"I think it was in 1961 that Mr. Hughes wanted me to contact the then Vice President Johnson and have him suggest a law firm in Washington, D.C., to be the law firm of record in the TWA litigation."

A long legal battle between Hughes and TWA's directors for control of the airline had just begun. Hughes needed a politically important Washington law firm to represent him in court and before the Civil Aeronautics Board (CAB).

Maheu testified that Johnson, in a meeting in his vice presidential office, recommended the firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, where Johnson's long-time friend and associate, Abe Fortas, was then a senior partner.

The law firm was subsequently employed as one of the Hughes attorneys in the TWA case.

After Richard Nixon was elected President in 1968, Maheu recommended that the President's former New York law firm be added to the battalion of Hughes attorneys in the continuing TWA battle.

Hughes also gave Maheu one other instruction in 1961: Tell the vice president (Johnson) that he (Hughes) would support any candidate for political office whom the vice president would "like to see elected."

Maheu said he later was sent word that Johnson was "interested" in John Connally's candidacy for governor of Texas.

"Mr. Hughes instructed me to make a contribution out of Houston," Maheu said. "I believe it was Mr. Holliday (chief financial officer of Hughes Tool Co.) who handled that contribution."

A decade later, Connally was secretary of the Treasury. In early 1972, he was informed that the Internal Revenue Service, which reported to him, was conducting an intensive investigation of Hughes Tool.

"We had not only a civil investigation moving forward," former IRS Commissioner Johnnie M. Walters told an executive session of the Senate Watergate Committee in 1974, "but one being conducted by the Intelligence Division for possible criminal violations."

Walters said Connally's only instructions were that "IRS should act properly" and that the agency "should never harass taxpayers, should never be overbearing." Because IRS tax investigations are always secret, there is no way to determine the outcome of the agency's inquiry into the Hughes organization.

In 1968, Hughes was eager to help finance Richard Nixon's campaign, apparently more for reasons of political expediency than any identification with the former President's political beliefs. In a memo to Maheu, Hughes wrote:

"I want you to go see Nixon as my special emissary. I feel there is a really valid possibility of a Republican victory this year. If that could be realized under our sponsorship and supervision every inch of the way, then we would be ready to follow with Laxalt as our next candidate."

Laxalt is Paul Laxalt, a Hughes booster who was then governor of Nevada and now one of Nevada's U.S. senators.

Even though Hughes was confident of a Republican victory in 1968, he took out political insurance. The Hughes organization gave \$50,000 and \$25,000 to the campaigns of Nixon's chief Democratic rivals, Sen. Hubert Humphrey and the late Sen. Robert F. Kennedy.

Though Hughes often demonstrates a surprising grasp of political realities for someone isolated from the outside world, occasionally his eccentricities get the best of him. Maheu, in a deposition taken in Los Angeles, explained:

"One time in 1967 I showed Mr. Holliday (chief financial officer of Hughes Tool) a handwritten memorandum from Mr. Hughes wherein Mr. Hughes was asking me to make

a million-dollar payoff to a President of the United States. Mr. Holliday fainted, dropped the yellow sheet of paper on the floor and requested of me whether or not his fingerprints could be taken off the piece of paper."

Maheu added later that he refused to carry out Hughes' instruction.

Nevertheless, money is indeed dispensed with ease for political reasons in Hughes' secret empire.

For years, the Hughes organization maintained an apartment at the Balboa Bay Club in Newport Beach, Cal., near the Pacific Ocean, and a 60-foot sport fishing craft called the Alouette II moored nearby, for use by politicians and government leaders.

Frank L. Doyle, a Hughes employee, recalled in court testimony a "memorable" party aboard the Alouette.

Doyle said he received a call at the Hughes-owned Sands Hotel and Casino, where he worked, to prepare food for the vice president and a party of 20 aboard the Alouette that night.

"Arrangements were made for an airplane and they (the food) were flown to Newport Beach and taken on board the Alouette," Doyle said.

"And I was invited to go along and help serve the vice president and his party that evening. And we proceeded to Avalon where we had a buffet dinner on board the Alouette."

There were similar Hughes-sponsored affairs in Washington.

A barge cruise for top military men up the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal was described in congressional testimony by a former Hughes executive:

"... They laid in a whale of a party, using that barge on the old canal up beside the Potomac River. A lot of senior people were invited, and it was quite the talk of aviation circles."

Taking care of politicians' needs is an important task in the Hughes organization. As Maheu explained in one court proceeding:

"The activity consisted mostly of keeping a close contact with individuals in the political arena, entertaining them, going to various dinners myself or sending one of any representatives to the dinners, making the apartment in Balboa available to them, making the boat available to them, meeting them socially, learning when their wives were sick or children, and sending flowers; a continuing type of relationship."

Political favors were more direct—cash, in the form of generous political contributions or of retainers.

In Maheu's defamation suit against Hughes, Maheu contended he received \$475,000 in cash or checks from Hughes for "political contributions" from 1968 through 1970 alone.

According to documents filed in that case, "Hughes was apparently channeling through Maheu \$1,000 a month to a judge in Los Angeles." The judge's name was not disclosed.

The \$475,000 figure cited by Maheu did not include, of course, any political contributions made by executives or directors of Hughes Aircraft Co. during that same period.

In the 1972 elections alone, for example, Hughes Aircraft executives contributed \$254,200 to both major parties.

CONGRESSMAN ANDREW YOUNG REVIEWS OUR NATION'S PROBLEMS

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, on January 26, Congressman ANDREW YOUNG of

Georgia addressed the United Auto Workers and International Association of Machinists Legislative Conference in Washington, D.C.

In his remarks, Congressman YOUNG astutely reviewed our Nation's pressing problems. I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the transcript of Congressman YOUNG's speech:

PRESENTATION BY HON. ANDREW YOUNG, U.S. REPRESENTATIVE, GEORGIA, BEFORE THE UNITED AUTO WORKERS AND INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF MACHINISTS LEGISLATIVE CONFERENCE

PROCEEDINGS

Congressman YOUNG. Thank you very much. Mr. Woodcock, the outstanding president of this great international union, to all of my good friends from both the United Auto Workers and the International Association of Machinists, I come here to first of all say thank you, because had it not been for some of the work that you have done through the years I wouldn't be in Congress. What I represent, and what we now see happening across the nation, is the result of a coalition of goodwill that was formed in the early sixties, that you were very much a part of.

I don't think we can fully appreciate what happened in this nation in the last fifteen years, because it happened so smoothly, but whenever I see the troubles in Northern Ireland, or whenever I see the fighting and feuding that we now see on a day-to-day basis in Lebanon, I realize that our nation could have looked that way had it not been for Martin Luther King in 1955 and had he not found in organized labor, and especially on the part of your former president, Mr. Walter Reuther, a strong ally that let blacks in America know that the problems that we faced were not problems that we were going to have to deal with alone.

(Applause.) Congressman YOUNG. And when we came to march on Washington in '63 your unions were with us, and I think that that was something of a turning point in this nation. That was the coalition that put together the Voting Rights Act of 1965, that put together the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and blacks could not have done that alone.

You know, in the early days Dr. King used to say that if organized labor would come down South and organize we wouldn't have any trouble getting our rights, and we always hoped that we could get an organizing drive going in the South, because we knew that that would automatically liberalize the South. But it turned out to be the other way around.

We got our freedom in terms of an end to segregation as public policy, and in terms of the right to vote, and we so liberalized the South that now the climate there is safe for unions to organize. And when the state of Georgia could elect a governor out of a coalition of blacks and trade unionists you know there's a new day in the South altogether.

We see that coalition still continuing. We had a march in Atlanta just on the 15th of January, Martin Luther King's birthday, and we were pleased that UAW was so well-represented by your international vice-president, Mark Stepp. That continued association carrying on the mass action approach to change in this country, I think is one of the things that gives me great hope in America.

But then on the D.C. front I'm pleased to be a member of the Rules Committee.

And because of your support I find myself now sitting there where many of the political decisions are made about the process of what bills come to the floor, and that would not be without the coalition of goodwill which you have nurtured through these years, and which I think is still the most powerful force in the nation today.

There may be Republicans in the top seats, but actually, the broad base of American people are much more in tune with us than they are with the White House, and I think that we will see an end to the kind of anti-people rule that we have seen for the last eight years, come November 1976.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. When I think of these past eight years I think that it's been almost like a bad dream. The things that we worked for in the early sixties, that were very much at the tips of our fingers—we had first of all the desegregation of public accommodations. We had political changes in the South which brought not just me to the Congress of the United States, but at least thirty new types of Congresspersons from southern states that would represent the people's interests rather than the special interests.

We had a beginning of taking on the economic plight of poor people in this nation. But it was ended by some strange acts of assassination and accidents. No nation can afford to lose men like Martin Luther King, Robert Kennedy, John F. Kennedy, Walter Reuther, in a short period of time and survive. And we found ourselves in 1968 sitting back almost in a torpor. We didn't know what was going on, and we let Richard Nixon slip into the White House, not because we worked hard and he defeated us, but because most of us were still reeling from the effects of these assassinations, and accidents, and we did not get politically active until it was just a little bit too late.

And we have paid a terrible price for it, but I think we're going to right that wrong. We're going to correct that mistake, and we're going to turn this nation back into the right direction, and we're in the process of doing it now. When I hear President Ford talk about his priorities for the nation I hear a strange mixture of code words that while they sound good, when you stop and think about them they're really quite disastrous. Everybody now is upset with Big Government, and so do we tend to get upset with Big Government at times, because if you say a thing long enough and frequently enough, people begin to believe it.

But when I hear the Republican administration talk about Big Government, they're talking about dismantling the bureaucracy that helps people. By and large, when they say do away with Big Government controls they're talking about doing away with OSHA. They're talking about doing away with the Environmental Protection Agency. They're talking about not having a Consumer Protection Agency. They talk about the bureaucratic fiasco of the food stamp program, but they're really not after the poor, or the poorest of the poor.

Food stamps is the new code word for "niggers," and we'd just as well face it. But if you look at who is involved in the persecution, directed at our food stamps, by and large it's working Americans, Americans who have contributed to making this country great, who have paid a greater percentage of their income in taxes than the oil companies, and who because of faulty economic policies find themselves working only eight months out of the year.

Those are the people that this administration wants to cut off. Those are the people that Gerald Ford and William Simon are talking about when they talk about food stamp chislers. They're talking about honest, hard-working Americans. They're talking about you, and they're talking about me.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. So let's just take a look at that program as one example. That program has grown largely because unemployment has grown. Nobody wants to be on food stamps. People want to eat, though, but

by and large they want to work for a living. But it's been the economic policies of high interest rates and cutting back on federal spending at every point, it's been the kind of subsidy for the rich and free enterprise for the poor that's created a terrible economic climate.

And then, William Simon, the Secretary of the Treasury, talks about the food stamp chislers. But even in looking at the food stamp program, the errors in the food stamp program are not in food stamps going into poor people's pockets, or it's not in somebody getting more food stamps than they're entitled to. They call the error rate a certain percentage of error, but as many of those errors are people getting less than they're entitled to as are getting more than they are entitled to.

But the amount of money in the total food stamp program does not equal the amount of money that the Internal Revenue admits that it loses because of people not paying taxes. The amount of money that escapes from Internal Revenue each year is estimated by the Internal Revenue and the Treasury Department itself as being somewhere close to \$20 billion, and the entire food stamp program is only 6.2 billion. And so I wonder why it is that William Simon doesn't make some of his corporations pay the taxes that they're entitled to, instead of harassing the poor.

But the same whole program of divide and conquer, of pitting working people who have jobs twelve months a year against working people who only have jobs eight months a year, is part of the new strategy of dividing the labor movement and the American people in order that under the guise of so-called fiscal responsibility the administration might stay in power.

But you see, what we see in terms of bureaucracy is really an administration of a structure established by Democrats to help the people, which is now administered by a bunch of scoundrels and hoodlums and political hacks who don't believe in it in the first place. And no wonder the things are not working! It's like the cost of living was. I believed in the need of wage-price guidelines, but not the way the Republicans administer it, for they keep the lid on wages and allow prices to go wherever they want to go.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. And so I say to you this morning that the government that we have helped put together to serve the people of the United States doesn't need to be drastically changed. The only thing that needs to be changed is the people who are administering it.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. Of the two or three main issues that I think we've got to take on in this session of Congress, one of them we were marching about, and that is full employment. I think if there's anything we learned in this period, it is that you can't continue to have an economy that is held down by monetary policies, and expect the economy to expand. We also know now that an increased level of unemployment, which in most places now in the cities has gotten at least to twelve percent, and in the inner cities of our industrial areas, sometimes as high as twenty percent—that that happens, and still inflation does not come down, the old formula of having high unemployment to keep down inflation, just isn't working.

And we're not going to really deal with the problems of this economy until we have a growing, thriving economy where every American citizen who needs to work and wants to work can find a job at a decent wage.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. And that doesn't require any economic miracle. That only requires sound government policy. It requires

low interest rates and a stimulation of the housing markets. It requires the kind of interest in working people in America that realizes that when they have money in their pockets they buy American goods and people go back to work. That's what happened in the tax cut. The Ford administration wanted to give the tax cut to the rich, but the rich would have put it away somewhere for a rainy day. The Congress which you elected insisted on sending that tax cut, seventy percent of it, back to people who made less than \$20,000.00 a year, and they went out immediately and spent it.

And one of the reasons we see people going back to work in the automobile industry is because people took their \$200.00 tax rebate, and with the kind of mechanisms that the automobile industry used to promote sales, we find people buying automobiles now, and the economy beginning to turn around and the date of that turnaround, everybody—Democrat and Republican alike—dates back to April of 1975 when people began to get their tax rebates.

The people do have confidence in the American system. People do have the confidence in the American products and goods, and if people have any money at their disposal they will go out and purchase those, and that's the way to get an economy moving.

But government policy has got to decide that every American citizen has a right to a job, and they're not going to decide that unless we make them decide it, and I think that we've got to realize that fighting for full employment is not doing something for somebody else, it's doing something for ourselves, for you see the person who is unemployed almost has a better time than the person who has a job, and is scuffling along paying taxes trying to make ends meet.

When Mark Stepp was down marching with us in Atlanta and we marched down Auburn Avenue 25,000 strong on a cold day in Georgia, it must have been about 25 degrees, the wind whistling down Peachtree Street, but we had about 25,000 people out there marching. But the things that disturbed us was there were people lining the sides of the streets, almost as many as were in the march, and they weren't getting in the march, and halfway down the street I began to wonder, why the hell am I out here marching for these folks, and they don't want to march for themselves?

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. Because I was cold!

(Laughter and applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. But then I realized I'm not marching for them. I realized that I'm marching because each one percentage point of unemployment takes \$16 billion out of our budget, and that that \$16 billion is money that we need for health insurance. That's money that we need to stimulate an economy and create economic growth. And that poor people have learned to survive, and they've been poor so long that they have lost hope.

Dr. King used to talk about an old guitar player on Auburn Avenue that used to sit there and pluck his guitar, and he would sing a song saying that I've been down so long that getting up don't cross my mind.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. And that's what happened to the hard core unemployed in America. They have learned to make it. They have learned to make it on all kinds of federal programs which are good federal programs, but unfortunately, too many of them have learned to make it in crime. Our cities pay a price for unemployment in terms of the stuff that is stolen from us day by day, and the only proven answer to crime is jobs, and either we put people to work gainfully, or we continue to struggle with them trying to steal to get by, and to hustle.

On a day-by-day basis the average guy on the street sees the crime in the suites, and we see what's happening in terms of the sort of big business hustle, and so they say that's the name of the game. I'd just as soon hustle in my little numbers thing down here on the street. I do just about as well as I can any other kind of way.

But those same people will do again what they did in 1964 when we introduced a massive program in the office of economic opportunity. Some of those same little hoodlums off the street put on a shirt and tie and got themselves an attache case and went to work every day, and were just as proud, even though they didn't have anything in their attache case but their lunch.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. They were part of the dream, and they felt like they were citizens who were respected by the nation. We can turn around this economy with jobs better than any other way to turn it around much better than the kinds of tax incentives for big business, which President Ford is advocating. And I won't say such about health insurance, except that it's getting to the place where we've got to have it. I've got four children. My oldest daughter is twenty years old. She was born in a little hospital down in South Georgia. My wife stayed in the hospital two and a half days. It cost us \$32.00. I was a poor country preacher, didn't have any kind of insurance. I had saved up \$50.00 for my hospital bill, and was pleased to death that I got \$18.00 back.

We had another baby two years ago and I got the best health insurance in the country, the Congressional Health Insurance, and yet when my wife spent the same two and a half days in the hospital—we've been paying money every month and never used it except to have that baby—and they told me after two and a half days that I still owed an additional \$154.00.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. Now it's getting to the place where you cannot afford to be sick, where being in the hospital is tantamount to bankruptcy, and they say in the District of Columbia that by 1980 hospitals beds will be about \$400.00 a day.

I just want to say that I've introduced comprehensive health care legislation to do for the American people what they do for the Congress. When I got—

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. When I got to the Congress they took me in and they gave me an electrocardiograph and a full health examination and they put my whole medical history on a little card that I can keep in my wallet. If I get sick, everything the doctor needs to know in terms of the preliminary examinations is right here. If there had been anything seriously wrong with me they would have cut it down to about half this size and put it around my neck as a dog tag.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. That—these tests, doing it in advance like that, made it cost about \$35.00. If they did them on an emergency basis when I got sick it would cost upwards of \$200.00. But there are ways to deliver health services and save money by doing health care in a preventive manner, rather than waiting till the machine breaks down before they start cutting and chopping on it.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. But Congress is not going to move on that this year unless you make us move.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. It's not that the Congress is evil or bad. Privately everybody says they need it and they want it, but we are weak and frail and sinful just like everybody else, and you all have jurisdictional disputes in unions all the time. We've got a jurisdictional dispute going in the House of Representatives. Everybody wants to know where it belongs. Ways and Means has got health care going, and the Commerce Health Subcommittee has got health care going. Somebody's got to get us together.

And you can go to the leadership of the House of Representatives and say look, whether the Senate votes or not, whether the President vetoes it or not, the American people need on the agenda for the presidential elections a comprehensive health care bill that will establish it as a national priority to be implemented by the Democratic President in 1977.

(Applause and cheers.)

Congressman YOUNG. And the only way we can get that is by the House of Representatives passing a bill and letting the people overcome the fears that have been instilled by the American Medical Association. You know, they accuse us of socialized medicine, but they don't call it socialized insurance when the doctors want the state to pick up malpractice insurance. They don't call it socialized medicine when they come to the federal government for the capitation of medical colleges. They don't call it socialized medicine when they come to the federal government for new funds to build additional hospitals. They only call it socialized medicine when it's going to give the people something.

And we've got to get over that, and we've got to help the American people to see that there's no reason in the world why this nation shouldn't extend its health care delivery system to every American citizen.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. And that's basically a question of tax reform. The Congress started a very good tax reform bill, and we would have gotten it through the House of Representatives just before this Christmas recess, except that it sort of got bogged down in the Senate. But all we were trying to do was close the loopholes. We weren't trying to take anything from anybody. We were just trying to make sure that because you paid at least 13, sometimes as much as 17 percent of your income in taxes, we just think that Exxon ought to pay a little more than 3.2 percent of their billions.

(Applause and cheers.)

Congressman YOUNG. But the attempt to have an equitable tax system in this nation was sandbagged by a Republican minority hiding behind a so-called veto-proof Congress, because some of our Democrats can slip over, and under the guise of fiscal responsibility and conservatism give a vote that takes money out of your pockets and puts it in the pockets of big business. I hope you're here to track down those fellows and tell them that their days are numbered, that they've got to straighten up and do right.

(Applause and cheers.)

Congressman YOUNG. Now finally let me say that the foreign policy of this nation is something we've got to be actively concerned about. We have a vote in the House of Representatives tomorrow on whether or not we should send funds to Angola. Now I have studied Africa for a long, long time. In fact, I almost went to Angola as a missionary when I came right out of school. My church used to send money to Angola when I was in Sunday School, six, seven years old, and every one of those people over there struggling to be free got their education in Christian missionary schools.

Now they also, when they—when we told them they were children of God, and they wanted to run their own country, we were tied up with Portugal in NATO, and we said no, we can't help you. So they turned to the Russians and to the Chinese and to the East Germans and to the Czechs, and they got guns from wherever they could, and they succeeded in getting rid of the domination of Portugal.

Now, they came to visit members of the Congress back in June and July, and what they said to us was please don't do us what you did to the Cubans. Don't drive us into the Soviet camp. Don't cut us off. They said, we want to sell our goods. They've got to sell their goods to the United States, because they produce oil, they produce copper, they produce cobalt, they produce bauxite, they produce coffee and cocoa, and Russia isn't importing any of those things, and China isn't importing any of those things either. If they are going to have money to run their governments they've got to be able to sell to the west, and they insisted that they wanted to be a non-aligned African nation.

But somehow Kissinger doesn't understand that. And somehow Kissinger has wanted to extend the Cold War politics into Africa where frankly I don't think we can win, because regardless of what you say, we cannot win in Africa when we are in any way linked up with South Africa.

And so I don't see us sending good money after bad. I don't see us sending American goods and weapons in to what essentially is a tribal war. Africa will have its tribal differences, and one tribe will usually end up conquering the others, or pulling it together, and working out some government. It's happened almost everywhere in Africa, but whenever they have finally gotten it together two things have happened. The first one is they put the Russians out. They did it in Algeria, they did it in Egypt, they did it in Ghana, they did it in Guinea, they did it in Congo Brazzaville, they did it in Nigeria most recently, and just last month or so they did it in Mozambique.

Mozambique was almost totally financed by the Russians. But when the war was over, and Russia wanted a naval base in Mozambique the people of Mozambique said no, we are a non-aligned African nation. I think Angola will do the same thing, no matter which government dominates, and I think it's a terrible mistake to get America involved in a war in Africa, because that's the only way the Russians can win. The only thing the Africans need and want from Russians is weapons, and as long as there's fighting going on the Russians have a stake in Africa. As soon as the fighting stops the Russians have to go.

And the truth of it is the Russians are worse racists than Americans. They are! They've never had any contact with colored peoples. They have a segregated university for African students called Patrice Lumumba University that the average Russian calls The Zoo.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. And every African student I've seen that studied in Russia has had a miserable experience, whereas in spite of our problems here we have been fussing and fighting, but we've been getting along, and we know each other, black and white, in this nation, and every African student that comes to this country, while he might have one or two unpleasant experiences in the course of his four years, overwhelmingly they love America and they want to relate to the American way of life.

And you see, we don't need to conquer Africa with weapons, because American working people have demonstrated the capacity to do it better. When Nigeria got ready to buy trucks, even though they were given weapons by Russia they looked around at who had made the best trucks in the world, the American worker, and so they got a contract to buy \$125 million worth of American trucks, because the only thing that can stand up on African roads are something built for the kind of dirt roads and super-highways that we have in this country.

(Laughter and applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. When the African people look around for goods they look to

America, because we have produced the kind of lifestyle that the whole world wants a piece of, and as soon as we get through fighting and allow these people to enter into the economic trade, giving their resources in exchange for the goods that we manufacture, the sooner the American economy is going to get back on the mainstream, and the sooner we will have peace in the world through economic competition, and not through military confrontation.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. And so I would turn America's destiny over to the American worker. I would not trust the Kissingers and their deals.

(Applause and cheers.)

Congressman YOUNG. I think that as we look at this nation, and as we think of all the troubles that we have, as we think of the problems that we've been through, and we have been through many, still we have come further, and come further together, than I ever imagined would have been possible. There are thirty new members from the south in the House of Representatives. There are seventeen black members in the Congressional Black Caucus—and yet we're not a black caucus. We haven't had a black vote since I've been here.

(Laughter.)

Congressman YOUNG. The Black Caucus functions mainly as a poor people's caucus, because most black folk happen to be working people and poor people, and so by and large, if you look at the votes that the black caucus considers important, and you look at the votes that organized labor considers important, they are one and the same.

(Applause.)

Congressman YOUNG. And so I approach this 200th anniversary of this nation with a great deal of hope, and sometimes when I get discouraged and think that it's—you know, we're not making the progress that we want to, when I see the bad things that get the publicity, I turn on a record that I have sung by one of our prophets, by the name of Ray Charles, and he sings a song that we sang in school, and it starts out "O Beautiful, for heroes proved in liberating strife, who more than self their country loved, and mercy more than life. America, America, God done shed his grace on thee, and crowned thy good with brotherhood from sea to shining sea."

And that's what you represent. From California to Maine, from Chicago down to Mississippi, you represent America, and America is great and wonderful today because you have worked hard, you have contributed to the building of an economy, you have fought for justice for your brothers, and though we have just begun that fight we are making such progress that in the words of the old blues singer, we've gone too far, we're too far gone to turn around.

And so I'm sure we're on the right track, and I'm sure we're going to get there. How hard you work and how hard we work will determine how soon we get there, and I think we're going to make it, and we're going to make it much quicker than any of us might have imagined.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

PUERTO RICAN CULTURE AT MUSEO DEL BARRIO

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues

the fine creative work being done by female Puerto Rican artists in my home community. The work that these women have done, in spite of the numerous obstacles they have faced, illustrate that these are truly dedicated artists determined to achieve their goals.

The Museo del Barrio, located in the East Harlem community in the Fifth Congressional District, had an exhibit of the work of female Puerto Rican artists during the month of February. I would like to include in the RECORD at this point a news release detailing the lives of two of the artists whose works were displayed. I know my colleagues will enjoy learning about this new breed of artists. The release follows:

ISABEL NAZARIO—PORTRAIT OF THE ARTIST, AS A SOUTH BRONX PUERTO RIQUEÑA

(By Robert Collazo)

Although they have arrived at the same place about the same time, Puerto Rican artists Alicia Maury (CNS—February 24) and Isabel Nazario, both of whom recently participated in East Harlem's Museo del Barrio's all-female exhibition, have traveled by very different routes. Unlike Ms. Maury who, despite later hardships, had the good fortune of spending her formative years in Puerto Rico surrounded by a healthy, creative environment, Isabel Nazario, a native of Ponce, Puerto Rico, but a product of the streets of the South Bronx, had to make it virtually alone, surviving the kind of family trauma that might have shattered the most serious of artistic spirits.

"I want to tell stories with my work," Ms. Nazario said this week, motioning to a pencil sketch displayed in one wing of the Museo exhibition. The sketch entitled "El Sueño" (The Dream), is what she calls a representational work, and it depicts an event which has become a Puerto Rican nationalist rallying point, "El Masacre de Ponce" (The Massacre at Ponce). That day in Ponce, Puerto Rico, March 21, 1937, government troops opened fire on a contingent of nationalist demonstrators marching through the city streets. Many of the marchers were killed. Isabel had become familiar with the incident through stories that her father, an eye-witness, had recounted to her as a child.

The artist, years later, had a dream about the incident as if she herself had been in Ponce on that fateful March day. She portrays the 1937 carnage in "El Sueño," but in a way which is almost devoid of violence. The penciled figures are drawn very lightly, almost tentatively. And almost without exception the group of standing, bending, running and crouching figures are faceless, save for the outlines distinguishing male from female, adult from infant. The effect is eerie, indeed; ghostlike in impact. There are no identifying signposts, benchmarks; no frame of references at all to place the viewer in Ponce, Puerto Rico on that day in March, 39 years ago. Thus, the scene takes on the intangible property of a dream, depicting, not so much one colonizer pitted against one colonist, as unveiling an ethereal, universal crime in which man destroys man.

The Nazario family, like the thousands of others who came north during the great migration of the early fifties, came primarily to escape the deprivation that gripped Puerto Rico's stagnant agrarian economy. And like the rest of the new arrivals, they came entertaining grand dreams of prosperity.

The family came to settle after a brief year stay in Chicago, at 1133 Longfellow Avenue in the heart of the South Bronx. There, Isabel along with her five brothers and sisters were to grow up and go to school, taking their place alongside the sons and daughters of the earlier waves of European working class immigrants.

As Isabel worked her way through grade school, her father—once a sugar cane cutter on the island—then became, in gradual stages, a dishwasher, an alcoholic, and finally a man of the street, whom Isabel would hardly ever see.

Her mother developed terminal cancer which would set the stage for the family's dissolution. "I remember coming home from school one day and seeing Mami and Papi there together watching television. I was always afraid of him because he was always beating everybody when he was drunk, so I carefully cuddled up to my mother and whispered my question: 'What's he doing home, Mami?' She just laughed and then told me that he was turning over a new leaf. He had promised to stop drinking and get himself together. I never remembered sketching anything at home before, just at school. But this time I went to my room, got my crayons and sat down to sketch the whole scene. I was very happy."

Even as she spoke, knotted into a crouch with her legs folded yoga-style upon a wooden bench in the gallery of the East Harlem museum, Isabel Nazario's soft, fragile voice wavered before the prospect of recounting the trials of her youth, frame by frame.

And as her story developed, Ms. Nazario wove a tapestry of despair and alienation, of sorrow and pain leaving one to marvel that so sensitive a spirit was not completely overwhelmed by the lonely struggle. She worked in one of the hundreds of little factories that dot the South Bronx to help maintain her family while her mother was dying from cancer. She eventually saw her brothers and sisters split up after her mother's long illness and death. Two of her younger brothers and sisters turned addicts in their struggle to escape the detachment and loneliness of the orphanage they were placed in after their mother's death. And her father also would return to drinking.

All of this combined to make an already reticent little girl retreat further inward. Despite the progress she had recently been making after school in her art studies with the help of a kind and concerned teacher, she was forced to drop out of junior high school.

But she survived. "I returned to classes just a few months before I was supposed to graduate. I had some really great teachers who really wanted me to graduate and they helped me put a portfolio together to apply to both Art and Design high school or Music and Art. So I struggled through some very rough times there, passed my final exams, completed my portfolio and got accepted to Music and Art. After that I didn't go back for the remaining time I had at J.H.S. I guess you could say I 'bogarted' my way through J.H.S."

Another stride forward came when Ms. Nazario was awarded a summer scholarship to the Art Students League, but the fragile Puerto Rican teenager would be shocked when she got there.

"I walked into the class," said the artist smiling, "and looked up to find all these people busy sketching this nude woman. She was absolutely naked; I was shocked and had to leave the room. The instructor hurried out to see what was wrong with me and when I told him, he couldn't believe it. Well, I'd never seen a nude before, not even a picture of one. I went home for the day and told my mother and she laughed at me. After that day, when I would return home from the League with nude sketches my mother would look at them and remember that first time, and laugh all over again."

But, however much she tried, Isabel could not feel completely at ease with her new found colleagues. She sensed that she was not the same as the others. And she began to feel that her upbringing had kept her from developing her self-confidence and was inhibiting her creative energies. Her instruc-

tor encouraged her to continue despite the difficulties but in the end Isabel did not return for her second month of summer instruction.

Her experience at Music and Art High School was also disappointing. The artist completed only one year at the prestigious special school. "That was that period that they had a lot of racial strife at the school. Things were happening and I was frightened. I was also becoming much more aware of who and what I was and how different I was from the majority of other kids there, White kids, wealthy kids. It was a real trip. I'd see many of these kids being driven to school by their parents all the time. There was also a great difference in their manner and experience. All these kids had been places, done things, exposed to lots of things; they were really hep."

The artist's anxiety over the gulf between her own humble beginnings, as matched against those of her White middle class peers, grew steadily, only to be heightened by the overt racial hostility between students that began to flare up at the school circa 1966. But even the most innocuous classroom situations caused Isabel great emotional stress.

Isabel described one incident during one of her art classes that completely unnerved her. "My teacher told us he wanted to see some drawings of our homes. I panicked. 'Does he mean where we live?' I asked a student on my right, 'That's right' he said. Well, I didn't know what to do. I didn't want those kids to see where I lived. I just couldn't do that."

"There were also other things about the way they did things at Music and Art that bugged me. I couldn't paint, for example, still lifes. And this was something they required you to do. But I simply couldn't relate to doing paintings of apples and bananas when there was so much turmoil in my life. It wasn't a matter of ability either, just relevance."

By the end of her first year at Music and Art High School, she had decided to drop-out, but another factor had already rendered her decision academic; Isabel was pregnant.

She married her baby's father, but the marriage died quickly. Isabel, nevertheless, bore a son, Jerry, who is now nine years old. In the meantime, she continued to paint, thinking she would be fulfilled by her art and her son. Her contentment was short-lived. "I became independent very young," admitted the artist, "and I knew that set me apart from a lot of people. I was on my own now. But I began to think of my mother, of her life, and how she was illiterate until I taught her how to write her name at the age of 35. It was then I think that I realized that I wanted to go to school, that there was a lot that I wanted to know about. And I did."

Isabel completed a high school equivalency course, then briefly attended Manhattan Community College in 1970, and finally matriculated at Queens College where she graduated with a B.A. in Art this past January.

While at Queens College, Isabel met and married her second husband, Julio, and had a second child, a daughter named Athena, age five. "Julio would actively help with the housework and things, but I really felt guilty because he was picking up after me, and we fought about it all the time. I guess I hadn't heard about the women's movement then. But we've managed to work a lot of things out in so far as roles, so I guess you could say that I've really lived my feminism and am still growing, along with Julio."

And so at this point, Isabel Nazario, the once shy little girl who used to escape the monotony of her elementary school routine by secretly drawing funny pictures of her teachers from the back of the room, has come full circle to become a serious artist and painter, a mother and wife. "I'm just glad to be running my own life," Isabel said.

THE REALITIES OF POWER

HON. JOHN L. BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. JOHN L. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, in today's world of global power struggles, the players remain the same, but the stakes continue to get higher and higher.

World politics is certainly no game in which the players can afford to be ignorant of the rules, nor blind to the realities of military power and defense capabilities.

Almost as important as the weapons we fight with are the attitudes and policies which motivate us to wage battle.

And since there is an important relationship between these two factors, it behooves us even further to have a clear understanding of the realities of power.

Mr. Speaker, the perils and potentials of oversimplification of power have been effectively dealt with in an editorial which appeared in the March 15, 1976 issue of the U.S. News & World Report magazine.

I believe that it is important for my colleagues in Congress to read and be aware of this particular viewpoint on this matter.

The text of the editorial follows:

REALITIES OF POWER

(By Howard Fieger)

This being election year, the air will be filled from now until November with argument about defense and military power.

Much of it will be beside the point.

Already, the campaign trail is strewn with such charges as—

We are spending too much on arms;

We are neglecting our defense;

We are too tough on our opponents;

We are not tough enough;

We are the No. 1 military power;

We are second to the Soviet Union in arms, or soon will be;

The Soviets are cheating us;

Not so. We're cheating ourselves.

On and on, and it's only the beginning.

It isn't too early, therefore, to pay heed to a note of caution:

There is a serious danger in all this oratory—the danger of oversimplification. Military might involves far more than the numbers of weapons and divisions on one side or the other. The intangibles of defense have become as significant as the arsenals.

This is a problem much on the mind of Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, a distinguished military and diplomatic careerist who has not let retirement distract him from concern about the U.S. and its place in today's world.

In a communication to this magazine, the former Chief of Staff says:

"As an old soldier of hawkish persuasion, I would instinctively rally to the side of those who insist on being at least second to none if I were sure of what that slogan means in practical terms. The concern of the vocalizers is clear enough—an apparent imbalance to our disadvantage developing between the warmaking potential of the United States and that of the U.S.S.R.—but how can such a difference in potential be measured?"

How, indeed?

Certainly, national will and cohesion are key factors. If, in a crisis, a nation falls short in such intangibles, then any advantage it may have in weapons becomes meaningless.

No matter how one may feel about Angola,

to pick an example, there can be little doubt that it was a test of just such intangibles between Moscow and Washington. The Soviet Union, even though inferior in long-distance strategic power, won over a superior U.S. because the Soviets had the determination to act and the U.S. lacked a unified will to challenge them.

Intangibles, not firepower, were decisive. It probably is such situations that cause General Taylor to worry that defense will be debated in terms that are too narrow to be meaningful. As he puts it:

"What we should want to know is whether our aggregated national power, made up of political, economic, military and spiritual components, is adequate to assure our security and well-being despite the opposition to be expected from the Soviets and all other unfriendly forces in a turbulent world."

"While Soviet malevolence backed by increasing military strength is likely to remain a primary obstacle, it is only one of several. . . . We have serious internal weaknesses which the Soviets exploit but did not cause—inadequacies of government and leadership, national disunity, and self-destructive political and social practices."

"We would be ignoring the essential needs of national security if we focused our concern exclusively on our military strength in relation to that of the U.S.S.R. . . . After all, unlimited military force is of little avail without a trusted national leader to direct it and a united people to support him in its use."

"Heavily armed but divided, we would run the danger of feeling superior to all but being in fact second to many in the effectual power which counts."

That is the pitfall if simplistic debate ignores the realities of power.

OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the Congress to a speech given recently by Patty Gordon of Napa, Calif., in the Veterans of Foreign Wars "Voice of Democracy Scholarship Program."

Patty was awarded first place in a contest which drew 35 contestants speaking on the theme, "My Responsibility as a Citizen."

Patty has been very active in school and community activities showing that she "practices what she preaches" in her own life. Patty typifies the spirit and attitude of the young people of our country and, in my judgment, gives us reason to look forward confidently to the future.

Because of the articulate and appropriate way in which Patty expressed views that all of us share, I believe her speech is worthy of being inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this Bicentennial year.

The speech follows:

OUR BICENTENNIAL HERITAGE—PATTY GORDON
Involvement!!! I feel that this is the key to our American Bicentennial Heritage. Over the past 200 years America has come alive through involvement. One person alone can not build a strong, successful country such as ours, not ten, not a hundred, not even a thousand. But numbers mean nothing when it comes to building a country. It takes peo-

ple working together, fighting together, living together as a whole. All working for a common cause . . . America.

When a person wants to become a leader or follower or inventor or any part of a group that is doing something, it shows that he cares. These are the people that have built America. They were not all leaders and not all followers, but they all did their best to bring America up to the standard it is at now.

Looking back on our strong heritage, the slogan "Join or Die" comes to my mind. This slogan first appeared as the caption of an illustration which accompanied an editorial by the great man and inventor, Benjamin Franklin. This slogan was started to stir up the colonies and unite them to hold forces against the French and their Indian allies. Later, in the Revolutionary War, the slogan was interpreted to signify that the colonies must unite in their struggle for political rights against domination and interference by parliament and the Crown. I personally think that, although the slogan was used literally, it was in the backs of everyone's minds when World War Two broke out here. And is still in peoples minds when they think of their patriotic duty to America.

Freedom and Liberty are other words I associate with our American Heritage. Samuel Adams and Patrick Henry were instrumental in articulating and keeping alive the spirit of America. Adams was the leader in The Sons of Liberty and organizer of many acts of resistance such as the "Boston Tea Party." Henry, a distinguished lawyer and statesman from Virginia, was the most consistent spokesman for colonial rights ever. He is most remembered for his "Give Me Liberty, or Give Me Death" speech which is recorded in history books everywhere.

I feel that with people like these to look up to with honor and pride, I can better appreciate the effort I put into my own working in school activities and school government as well as activities to help in my community.

This means very much to me and I am sure that all over the United States, young people just like myself have the same feelings of the powerful heritage we have learned to maintain. And I think the past generations have not only maintained this image but added to it for the better. Now, in our country people can do whatever they want, within suitable boundary, and be whatever they want to be. My goals may go as far as being the first female president ever. For me, this seems possible for the future. The way our country is working now on, not only female involvement, but in all reaches of involvement, anything could happen. People are working together, and striving together for a Better America. This has proven to me that from the past we can learn for the future.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. LLOYD MEEDS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. MEEDS. Mr. Speaker, St. Patrick's Day has been observed in America since colonial times, and all over the world. Wherever there are Irish, their feast day is celebrated March 17. In 1976 the "Friendly Sons of St. Patrick" will convene at the Mirabeau Room in Seattle to celebrate the 36th annual dinner. Pre-

siding will be President Jerry F. Lavell and Vice Presidents Jim Price and John Costello.

Irishmen of all types will be present to honor the patron saint of the Irish, Saint Patrick.

Highlights of the event will be the awarding of scholarships by Cornelius Chevell; the first public appearance of the acting president of Seattle University, Father William Sullivan, S.J.; and the installation of new officers.

This event is the only one of its kind in the Pacific Northwest and is traditionally the focal point of all activities for all Irishmen in the Seattle area.

My congratulations to the Friendly Sons of St. Patrick, the officers, Mr. Chevell, and Father Sullivan.

A CONCERNED YOUNG AMERICAN

HON. G. V. (SONNY) MONTGOMERY

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. MONTGOMERY. Mr. Speaker, I recently received a most thought provoking letter from a high school senior in my district which very well summed up my own feelings about our Nation and my fellow Americans.

Miss Margy Lee, a student at the Forest, Miss., high school echoed my own sentiments in very compelling words of the disaster course we are charting with excessive Government spending.

However, she also rightfully recognized the ability of the American people to solve their problems and their willingness to do so. I am encouraged that we have young Americans like Margy Lee who love their country and want to be a part of the solution to our Nation's problems. I would like to share her letter with my colleagues and urge them to take Miss Lee's message to heart:

MARCH 9, 1976.

Cong. G. V. "SONNY" MONTGOMERY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: I am an 18 year old senior at Forest High School. As you probably know, American government is a required course for high school seniors. About a week ago, in my government class, we learned about debt ceilings. We learned that Congress has the power to borrow money on credit of the United States, and that there is no Constitutional limit on how much it can borrow; instead, Congress has to limit itself. As Mrs. Margaret Richardson, my government teacher, told us, the debt ceiling is the farthest we can go into debt. Our entire class was shocked at the present debt ceiling of \$577,000,000,000.

How can our great country survive if we keep going farther and farther into debt? We must stop going deeper into debt and start paying them off or quit extending this debt ceiling. We have got to do as the word implies; put a "ceiling" over our debts once and for all.

Mr. Montgomery, I am a young person—a concerned young person. I love my country so much that there are no words to express it. It is true that "the young people are

the leaders of tomorrow," and I want to be a leader of tomorrow—I want to be a leader of today. I feel that we must start now to get our country going in the right direction.

The United States of America is the greatest country in the world. I would give my life to preserve our freedoms we take so for granted. I don't want to sound like I'm making some kind of patriotic speech—or maybe I am. All I know is I'm writing to you each word as it comes into my heart.

I've thought many times that I would like to have some sort of career that would benefit my country. It all started when I was in the eleventh grade and taking American history—again, under Mrs. Richardson. We were required to read a book on Communism. Thank Heaven I read mine! I got totally involved with the book *Masters of Deceit* by J. Edgar Hoover, and read many more books about Communism. This feeling has stayed with me even to this day. The future frightens me because Communism frightens me. I see it all around us, and I feel so helpless. But I'm not helpless; America is not helpless. Our older people need re-educating on its threat, and our young people need to understand it if we're going to continue to live free lives. I believe there should be required courses on Communism. The Soviets are taught from the moment they are born that they exist only for the Party. I feel that somewhere along the way, we tend to forget to instill in our young people that we are living in a free country, but that there are sometimes certain measures that have to be taken to keep these freedoms.

This is the first time I've ever written to my Congressman. So many people don't want to get involved in these matters; some people do, but just never get around to doing anything. I want to get involved, and I appreciate those like you, the people's representatives.

Sincerely,

MARGY LEE.

ACTION NEEDED ON SYNTHETIC FUELS

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this country is dragging its feet in developing synthetic fuels and we might as well face up to the problem. We simply are not moving fast enough or showing enough determination to find and produce substitutes for natural gas or gasoline, even though much of the technology exists right now to do the job.

To remedy this, I have introduced H.R. 11494 which would give great financial confidence to synthetic fuel industries—large and small—to forge ahead without the need for any Federal grants, loans, or guaranties. In short, the Federal Government would support the price of synthetic fuels against any disastrous disruption if the price of oil should drop—a highly unlikely possibility, but one which is impeding the investment of the necessary private capital.

We cannot lick this problem simply by mouthing a new dedication to the conservation of energy, however desirable that may be. We must learn some of the

lessons of the past in this regard. For that reason, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial from the March 12 issue of Science magazine. The text follows:

SYNTHETIC RUBBER IN WORLD WAR II

(By Arthur M. Bueche, Vice President for Research and Development, General Electric and Development Center)

It is ironic that in the bicentennial year of our Declaration of Independence, one of the major national issues is concern about our dependence on foreign nations for some of our vital resources. However, the idea of a foreign cartel setting the world price for a crucial world commodity is not new. Southeast Asia is particularly well suited to the growth of rubber trees on plantations. This fact made that part of the world even more important to the rubber industry than the Persian Gulf is to today's oil industry, and the owners of the rubber plantations were not slow to take advantage of that.

In 1922, Great Britain felt secure enough in its command of the rubber supply to set in motion a cartel program called the Stevenson Plan. They succeeded in quadrupling the price of raw rubber within 4 years. Incidentally, the "Shiek Yamani" of the Stevenson Plan was Britain's Foreign Secretary, a rising young politician named Winston Churchill. In 1934, the Dutch joined the British in a second rubber cartel. Between them, they were able to control prices and dominate world markets. This situation persisted right up until the beginning of World War II. Indeed, only tentative steps were taken to alleviate our dependence during the first 6 months after Pearl Harbor.

In short, it certainly was not due to the foresight of the American people or their leaders that we managed to pull off the amazing feat of going from complete dependence on foreign rubber supplies to virtually complete rubber independence in three short years. How did we manage it?

There were two unusually lucky circumstances. First, some imaginative people had been attracted to the emerging field of polymer science in spite of the rather dim prospect of anything forthcoming that would be practical on a large scale. Second, the Germans had had the lack of foresight to export to the United States a lot of technological know-how in the chemical field. However, the synthetic rubber program involved much more than luck. At least one aspect of the program carries a lesson which is applicable today.

America's "rubber crisis" of 1942 underlined an important point about technology and human nature. That is, it is easier to meet a problem through the large-scale use of technology than to get people to make a major change in their style of living. Let me explain how the rubber program illustrates this.

After Malaya and Indonesia fell to the Japanese in 1942, the reality of the nation's rubber shortage began to dawn on our national policy-makers. Two obvious courses of action presented themselves. One was to step up the effort to find a "technological fix"—that is, to greatly accelerate the synthetic rubber program. The other was the idea of "resource conservation"—that is, to drastically curb civilian uses of rubber and collect scrap rubber to meet our needs.

At first, the idea of conservation got the main attention. The papers were filled with the exploits of people like Abner Peel of Rahway, New Jersey, who figured out a way of patching and recycling ladies' girdles.

But conservation was a disappointment. Much less scrap rubber was collected than

had been expected, and problems of storage and transportation prevented even that from being used. The problem was not lack of patriotism or public willingness. Rather, it was the simple impossibility of totally turning around the ingrained habits of a society in a short time.

Fortunately, the technological fix solution was a bit more successful. Indeed, the success of the synthetic rubber program was fantastic by any standard. In 1940 not a single pound of general-purpose synthetic rubber was produced in the United States. By 1944, the annual production was over 670,000 tons.

What can this story teach us? The synthetic rubber program showed that a joint university-government-industry effort can be an effective method of meeting a national need that is just too big and too risky to ask a single industrial firm to undertake. The program also showed that we should not let important efforts be impeded by artificial distinctions between "pure" and "applied" research. Planning, research, and development are all necessary components of a total technical effort.

SAVING DAY CARE

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House will shortly consider the conference report on H.R. 9803, which will provide the States with an additional \$125 million to permit day-care centers around the country to meet health, safety, and staffing standards.

The Washington Post and New York Times each ran editorials on Monday, when H.R. 9803 was expected to come to the floor under suspension of the rules, explaining why the bill is essential to the preservation of the day care program. I commend these editorials to my colleagues' attention:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1976]

GIVING DAY CARE A CHANCE

There is little doubt that the day care program has been a great benefit to working women in this country, especially those who have been trying to make the transition from welfare to careers. No one can accurately count the dollars saved in welfare payments, or the dollars gained in the economy from goods and services sold or tax revenue received. But day care has proved that it makes sense to help people work. Now, because of legislative and bureaucratic entanglements, the day care programs in most of the 50 states are in jeopardy.

The House, acting under a suspension of its rules, will vote today on whether to accept a \$125 million conference report intended to assist the states in meeting a set of tough health, safety and staffing standards in their day care programs. Without these additional funds, the day care programs in most of the states will not be in compliance with federal regulations. Failure to comply with any one of the standards can mean loss of all federal funds.

A survey of the 50 governors has found that meeting those health and safety standards has been impossible for most of them with the funds available up to now. In many states, the staff requirements have been diffi-

cult to meet, but most governors say they can't meet the health, safety and management standards either. Yet, those standards are important if the parents of children are going to have confidence in the day care program. They must feel their children are in a safe and healthy setting.

In themselves, the standards pose no other problem than the money to help the states meet them. There is an argument from some Republicans on the Hill that the answer might be to delay putting into effect standards indefinitely. That is decidedly not the solution. Further delay only means either cutting services to meet the standards out of existing revenue or exposing small children to the danger that might befall them because the standards are not being met.

Neither of those is as attractive an alternative as that of having the House accept the conference report. It is an investment whose benefits demonstrably outweigh the cost. In addition to helping the states meet the physical standards, that \$125 million will result in the employment of more welfare recipients in the day care program. We think the House should make the investment without further delay.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 15, 1976]

DAY CARE SAVINGS

The provisions of the Social Security Act which support child care programs may be substantially nullified unless the House acts favorably on a bill which provides funds to bring local day care programs up to the standards required by Federal law.

Most states were already severely strapped for social services money when, in 1974, Congress enacted mandatory standards for federally assisted day care facilities covering such matters as health, nutrition and staff-child ratios. The trouble was that Congress failed to provide funds to help the states meet those standards and, as the time for putting them into effect approached, many programs were in danger of being cut off. To meet that problem, Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana drafted a bill to provide the money and added strong incentives for programs to hire people off the welfare rolls.

There is now some reluctance in the House—bolstered by menacing noises from the White House—to act favorably on the measure because it will cost \$125 million for the balance of this fiscal year. That is a pound-foolish view because in addition to serving nearly two million children, the program helps shave welfare costs. The director of Social Services in Georgia has estimated that its implementation in his state alone will produce an overall saving of \$2 million. The House ought not to miss this rare opportunity to do good and save money at the same time.

TRIBUTE TO MAURICE STEMBER

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, recently a most distinguished resident and long time acquaintance of mine in the Fifth Congressional District, Mr. Maurice Stember, passed away. A great part of his life was devoted to the service of his country and his fellowman and a tribute to him was published in the American Legion magazine in the issue of March

1976. I wish to spread it on the Record as a tribute to the service he rendered to his fellow Americans:

MAURICE STEMBER, 81, LEGION HONORARY PAST NATIONAL COMMANDER, DIES AFTER LONG ILLNESS

Maurice Stember, 81, of Rockville Centre, N.Y., long-time Adjutant of The American Legion's Dep't of New York and an Honorary Past Nat'l Cmdr, died January 20, 1976, after a long struggle against cancer.

Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., where he attended public schools, he distinguished himself both as an athlete and later as an official in basketball, baseball and football, during his school years and after graduation. He was a pioneer of what is now the nation's oldest organized youth activity outside those of schools and colleges, The American Legion Baseball Program.

During WWI, Stember served with Headquarters Company, 304th Field Artillery and "F" Company, 305th Infantry, both units being part of the famous 77th Division.

Stember played a vital role in the formation of The American Legion following WWI, after seeing the need for a large-scale veterans organization as a result of public apathy toward servicemen of that era. He was elected Adjutant for the Dep't of New York in 1927, a position he held up to the time of his death. Because of his long experience in Legion programs, he was mentor and advisor to many Legion Nat'l Commanders, Nat'l Executive Committees, and Legion staff members on all levels. During his long service to The American Legion, Stember held a number of national level commission and committee appointments. He contributed significantly to The American Legion's 50th Anniversary observance in 1969 as a member of the national organization's 50th Anniversary Com.

The American Legion recognized his outstanding service by naming him an Honorary Past Nat'l Commander through the unanimous action of the 57th Nat'l Convention of the organization in Minneapolis, August 19, 1975. Stember shared this unusual honor with only six other men, including Bennett Champ Clark and Theodore Roosevelt, Jr.

Stember was married in 1922 to the former Madlyn Heckler, who died in 1968. He donated a coronary care unit to her memory at Mercy Hospital in Rockville Centre where he spent his last days. Maury was remarried in 1970 to the former Muriel D. Habacker, who survives.

American Legion services took place at the Clayton & Forbell Funeral home, Rockville Centre, with Nat'l Cmdr Harry G. Wiles representing The American Legion. "Maurie served his fellow Legionnaires generally in an anonymous background," said Cmdr Wiles. "His last great contribution to America and to humanity was his original interest and great support for The American Legion's War on Cancer project, to which Mrs. Stember requested that, in lieu of flowers, memorial contributions be sent. Participating also in the services were Past Nat'l Chaplain Alfred G. Thompson, N.Y., New York Dep't Cmdr Leonard E. Baxter, and the Commander of Maury's post, Post 342, Freeport, Kenneth E. Combs. In charge of the funeral arrangements was Aldo R. Benedetto, New York Nat'l Executive Committeeman.

A large delegation of Legion leaders from around the nation attended the funeral services. Among those in addition to Nat'l Cmdr Wiles, were Past Nat'l Cmdrs James W. Wagoner, Robert E. L. Eaton, John H. Geiger, L. Eldon James, Judge Daniel F. Foley, Martin B. McKneally, and James F. O'Neil, publisher of The American Legion Magazine.

Also, Nat'l Adjutant William F. Hauck, Executive Director James S. Whitfield, Judge Advocate Bertram G. Davis, Assistant Executive Director Hollis C. Hull, Director of Pub-

lic Relations James C. Watkins, Federal Maritime Commissioner James V. Day, Dep't of Maryland Adjutant Daniel H. Burkhardt, Dep't Adjutant of Pennsylvania Edward T. Hoak, Dep't Adjutant of Indiana William D. Jackson, and Dep't Adjutant of Minnesota Frank C. Momen. Gilberto M. Font, Nat'l Cmdr's Representative of the Foreign Relations Commission, came from Puerto Rico to attend, as well as Nat'l Executive Committeemen from many states.

COMMEMORATING SLOVAK FREEDOM

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, I had the distinct honor to participate in a ceremony at city hall in Perth Amboy, N.J., commemorating the 37th anniversary of Slovak freedom. I want to share a speech given at that ceremony by Emil Bacha, former deputy commissioner of police in Perth Amboy. Mr. Bacha speaks of the history of the Slovak people, and of their long heritage of striving to be free. His words inspire us to support their wonderful cause, and I commend them to you.

REMARKS OF EMIL BACHA

On behalf of the combined Societies of Holy Trinity Parish, it is both a privilege and a pleasure, to welcome you here this morning, as we commemorate the 37th Anniversary of the declaration of Slovak Freedom.

Slovakia, consisting of 18,921 square miles with a population of 5,000,000 is a separate country. It is an individual member of the European family of nations. Though Slovakia lies in the very center of Europe, its name is not heard of in the world. The reason for that is the fate of this country, which for ages has not been able to emerge in history under its own name, and is not even today an independent country on the map of Europe.

The Slovaks occupied this country at the end of the 4th century, when it belonged to no one. The ancestors of the Slovak people attached to this country the destiny of all the succeeding Slovak generations, who in turn, established their claim to this land by the fact that during more than a thousand years, they never deserted or renounced it.

Out of the tiny Slovak principalities, a united Slovak State came into existence already in the first half of the 9th century. It was the first organized state in central Europe. By the year 830 during the reign of Prince Pribina, a Christian Church was standing in the ancient home of the Slovak princes in Nitra. It was the first Christian Church in the entire territory of the western Slavs. King Svatopluk (870-894) whom contemporary sources consider "the most glorious of the Slavonic rulers—almost as mighty as an emperor" extended his domain to include the neighboring Czech and Polish tribes. He waged successful wars against his western neighbors, maintained diplomatic relations and concluded diplomatic peace treaties with neighboring rulers, and safeguarded the independent status of his country.

For a century and a half (from 1540 until the end of the 17th century) Slovakia served as a bastion in the bulwark that defended Christian Europe against the danger from the East—against the attacks of the Turks.

The new ideas which later, under the slogan of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" resulted in the French Revolution, made their way into the Danube basin and affected also the nations of that region. Slovak consciousness developed and became strongly rooted in Slovak life itself. New great leaders emerged: Anton Bernolak, Jan Holly, Ludovit Stur, Hurban and many others.

When World War I was nearing its end, the leaders of the Slovaks saw that the military defeat of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy would give them the opportunity to attain the goals they were not able to achieve in the Monarchy.

On May 30, 1918, representatives of the Slovak League of America met with representatives of Czech organizations and with the President of the Czechoslovak National Council, Mr. Thomas G. Masaryk, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and drew up an agreement which guaranteed political and cultural independence to Slovakia in the new common state.

The Slovaks welcomed the Czechoslovak Republic with joy and sincere hope. But, the relationship between the Slovak and Czech nations was dimmed from the very beginning of their union. Slovakia was handled as a colony of another state. This was the reason why the Slovak Parliament on March 14, 1939, declared Slovakia an independent and self governing state. Unfortunately, today Slovakia serves as a huge prison behind the iron curtain. The Slovak nation, however, insists on an independent position in the great family of equal nations in Europe.

We hope and pray that the Slovak nation will one day, be granted to establish its own free, democratic state in a new age, that will not only universally recognize the natural right of nations to be free, but will provide the necessary means of world opinion and power, to guarantee that all men be free on our planet, and that it can no longer afford to tolerate human beings being half slave and half free.

CONGRESSMAN DRINAN INTRODUCES LEGISLATION TO ASSIST SURVIVORS OF SERVICE-CONNECTED DISABLED VETERANS

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation which provides automatic entitlement to dependency and indemnity compensation to the survivors of a veteran who was rated as totally and permanently disabled due to service-connected cause for at least 1 year prior to his death.

Current law does not recognize the full impact of total and permanent disability which has a catastrophic effect on overall physical or mental functioning and which can severely shorten the life expectancy of a veteran. Under present practice the survivors of a 100 percent service-connected disabled veteran are not entitled to DIC assistance unless the veteran's death is clearly ascribed to the disability or the disability is determined to have been a major contributory factor to the death.

Although the Veterans' Administration maintains that such determinations are made on a very liberal basis, a study of DIC claims showed that nearly 25 per-

cent of claims for death benefits filed by widows of totally and permanently disabled veterans were denied by the Veterans' Administration. Pursuant to the study of DIC claims the Veterans' Administration included material in its program guide for compensation and payment to "reemphasize and encourage a more equitable use of the discretionary power which is vested in the rating boards by controlling regulations and instructions pertaining to contributory cause of death." This material acknowledges that greater consideration should be given to the question of whether service-connected disability impaired the general health of the individual so that he or she was less able to fight disease.

In testimony before the Senate Veterans Affairs Committee, a representative of the Disabled American Veterans noted that:

In many instances even though a claimant may submit medical evidence which supports the claim for contributory cause of death, DIC benefits are denied by the VA on the basis of difference in medical opinion. This holds true even in cases where a veteran prior to death had a service-connected disability permanent and total in nature of many years duration. . . . We hold to the view that such a total disability must in and of itself virtually affect the general well-being of a veteran and therefore materially hasten the death process.

In addition to the question of whether the death was service connected, there is the matter of the financial condition of survivors of total and permanently disabled veterans. Veterans with such a rating are under severe economic handicaps as well. Their highly diminished earnings capacity most often denies their survivors, regardless of the cause of the veteran's death, an economic status they might have otherwise experienced. According to the Veterans' Administration study the average total income of widows denied DIC benefits was \$2,621 a year. This figure was apparently based upon a study of 1974 claims.

Beyond a liberal interpretation of the guidelines for establishing that death was service connected, there should be a statutory guarantee to a totally and permanently disabled veteran that at the time of death his survivors will receive some measure of security through DIC benefits.

The Veterans' Administration utilizes procedures for rating disability which provides for a clear and definite establishment of total and permanent service-connected disability before benefits are paid. Furthermore in other than disabling conditions which are static such as loss of limbs, VA policy provides for periodic review of the rating. There can be no doubt that the veteran who is awarded a total and permanent service-connected disability is severely incapacitated.

I am convinced that the death of these veterans cannot be separated from the total impact of the conditions for which they were rated as 100 percent service-connected disabled. Implementation of this change in the law would not alter the distinction that has always been held between service-connected and non-

service-connected disability; it merely acknowledges that in the case of catastrophic disability, death should be presumed to be related to the existence of a total and permanent disability.

Our national policy toward veterans benefits has always recognized the compassion and consideration that is due survivors of our disabled veterans. The survivors of totally disabled veterans whose death was not certified as related to their service-connected injuries and illnesses, have not been provided an equitable measure of our compassion.

Provisions to accomplish this change in the law have been discussed in the past. Most recently, the Senate approved an amendment to the Veterans Disability Compensation and Survivor Benefit Act which provided for automatic DIC entitlement to the survivors of 100 percent service-connected disabled veterans.

Before the above noted legislation was enacted it was decided to delete this provision until the VA completes a study of DIC claims made under the new guidelines. This entitlement should be moved from discretion and into a statutory right.

In commenting on the Senate amendment, the Veterans' Administration reported that the cost of implementation would be negligible—probably less than \$1 million a year. Furthermore, cost would be offset by reduced administrative costs entailed in determining such claims.

ST. PAUL'S CHURCH—THE NATIONAL SHRINE OF BILL OF RIGHTS

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, several months ago I introduced legislation which would provide for the National Park Service to permanently maintain and administer St. Paul's Church of Mount Vernon, N.Y., as a national shrine of the Bill of Rights. A companion measure was introduced in the Senate by Senator JAVITS.

St. Paul's was the site of the events leading up to the first free press trial in this country—the trial of John Peter Zenger, which took place over two centuries ago. The entire question of our first amendment free press guarantee has been the subject of much recent debate in this body. By way of enhancing our discussion of this topic, I would like to share with my colleagues some very thoughtful remarks concerning the indispensable role press freedom plays in this Nation and its relationship to St. Paul's Church. The following speech was delivered by the esteemed president of WVOX radio in New Rochelle, N.Y., Mr. William O'Shaughnessy. It is most fitting that these most insightful remarks on the subject of our first amendment protections were made on the grounds of St. Paul's Church, a truly historic symbol of our constitutional liberties:

REMARKS BY WILLIAM O'SHAUGHNESSY

Ladies and gentlemen: I shall not intrude for very long on your holiday. I come in gratitude and friendship for all the City of Mount Vernon has done for WVOX. I come to be with you because while others have forgotten what day it is—you have not forgotten. You come here as patriots and I am proud to be with you and proud to share this day with you.

We come to this Independence Day Observance without shame.

We come with confidence that our American nation will prevail. America will prevail because it deserves to prevail. And America will prevail because of each one of you.

You, ladies and gentlemen, members of the Westchester community and citizens in 1974 of the American nation have not forgotten your country today.

To many this July 4th is but the first of a five day holiday. "The glorious 4th," the headline writers will call it as they show our neighbors pursuing all sorts of fun and games and in flight, many of them, from their responsibilities of citizenship.

And though so few of us have remembered, it is right and proper that we should come here today to the Eastchester Village Green, to historic St. Paul's Church to renew and restore and rededicate ourselves to the great and towering principles which were identified and established in this special place.

It is the peculiar glory of this spot that it witnessed that dawn of civil liberty in America.

We do not honor this so-called Shrine of the Bill of Rights. This lovely old church is but a monument and thus it is perishable and will not last forever.

But the idea and the principle of freedom of thought which was affirmed here and went forth from this spot and spread throughout America and England is worthy of our tribute.

On this summer day in the 198th year of our American nation that idea, that glorious principle, is still not secure, is still under attack and is still in need of and requires your patronage and protection.

A big Westchester developer suggested to me at a dinner only a month ago: "Maybe we've gone too far with civil liberties."

Some years ago, we recall sadly, it was demanded that Eldridge Cleaver not be allowed to speak and be heard on the campus of a great Westchester college. I'm proud that our radio station identified with those who insisted that the militant be heard.

"We can never be sure," said John Stuart Mill, "that the opinion we are endeavoring to stifle is a false opinion, and if we were sure, stifling it would be an evil still."

And I haven't gone "public" with this, ladies and gentlemen, but I can tell you in the intimacy of this village green, that during this week just past—an outstanding national organization which should know better, has been trying to drive a radio program off the airwaves simply because it does not agree with the views espoused on the program or with the views of the principal backer of the program.

For me it is a simple issue: if you believe as we do that a radio station achieves its highest calling when it resembles a platform or a community soapbox or a forum of the expression of many different viewpoints—then as fiduciaries and trustees and permittees of the public airwaves, do we not have a clear obligation to let diverse and even at times, outrageous viewpoints, share that platform.

I think we do. And that's why I'm so proud to be associated with a station over which many different voices are heard in the land.

That's why I'm proud of the Daily Argus and the Standard Star and the other Westchester-Rockland newspapers which are encouraging more dissent, more feedback from

their readers and in very creative ways, are encouraging greater participation by its readership in our local papers.

A radio station went bankrupt in Rockland County last year and we recall the demise of two major New York City newspapers in recent years. It was not easy for the itinerant printer John Peter Zenger 200 years ago. And it is not easy for his heirs today. And thus I hope you will object and disagree with all your might when a newspaper or a broadcaster says or publishes something you disagree with. But remembering the lessons which are enshrined here in this place I hope you will insist on his right to say it.

By the same token, if a publisher or broadcaster will not allow you access or is doing a poor job—"censor" him by changing channels or by not buying his newspaper. That's as it was intended by our forefathers who tried to eliminate real censorship from our vocabulary forever.

"If all mankind minus one, were of one opinion, and only one person were of the contrary opinion, mankind would be no more justified in silencing that one person, than he, if he had the power, would be justified in silencing mankind."

That's good advice.

Finally, I would not do justice to the occasion, ladies and gentlemen, if I did not say a few words about our country and what it means to be a citizen in the 198th year of our splendid Republic.

These are difficult and confusing times for America. But it was ever thus. And even a casual reading of our exciting history will convince you that it has never been lacking in drama and turbulence.

It has never been easy for America. And it is not easy now. But America—I promise you, I guarantee you and I assure you—will be equal to the challenge of the present and to the challenge of the future as well.

It has been written that a nation is its people. America is not the Statue of Liberty or the Lincoln Monument. It is not this great historical site, St. Paul's Church. It is not even our magnificent flag—the stars and stripes. These are symbols.

America's richest asset are its people.

America is the courage and sensitivity and determination and devotion in the hearts of ordinary men and women just like each of us.

We cannot leave the preservation of our democracy in a republic to our president or to our governor or to our legislators. The responsibility is ours as members and citizens of the American Nation.

We salute a great nation today. And as we do, there are certain timeless virtues which must guide us: love of our fellow man, reliance on Almighty God—benevolent and generous Creator—and an awareness of the responsibilities of citizenship.

And as the great Governor of New York, Malcolm Wilson so often does, I would comment to your favorable judgment the inscription which appears on the facade of the Federal Courthouse at Foley Square in New York: "The true administration of justice is the firmest pillar of good government."

It has long been my belief that our nation can survive short-fall in its executive branch.

The country can get along with short-fall in its legislative branch.

But the Republic will not long prevail if the judicial branch is less than fair and just.

We must have a place—a special place—where citizens like us can go to seek redress against one another or even against a government.

I'm reminded of a marvelous quotation by the late Adlai Stevenson of Illinois which is quite appropriate to this occasion.

"What do we mean by patriotism in the context of our times? There is no great World War and as of this precise moment we thank God that American troops are not engaged in any ground action anywhere in the world.

Thus, what is patriotism in the context of these times?"

Stevenson said it is a much harder proposition than it is in time of war and strife.

Listen to this description from Adlai Stevenson: "We need a patriotism that puts country ahead of self." And that is easy enough to prescribe. But we also need "a patriotism which is not short, frenzied outbursts of emotion, but the tranquil and steady dedication of a lifetime. These are words which are easy to utter, but it is a mighty assignment. For it is often easier to fight for principles than to live up to them."

When an American says he loves his country, he means not only that he loves the Westchester hills, the Hudson River glistening in the sun, the wide and rising Long Island sound, the great mountains and the sea. He means that he loves an inner air, an inner light in which freedom lives and in which a man can draw the breath of self-respect.

"Be Counted Again" is the current and recurring theme of the American Legion and other patriotic groups. By your presence here this morning . . . you have truly been "Counted Again."

Now, go to your homes, ladies and gentlemen—secure in the knowledge that you at least remembered what it is we celebrate on this day in July. You remembered why the bands play and why the flags fly. You remembered why we send up rockets into the summer sky. The principles and ideas of freedom and liberty and independence are alive in your hearts. Let them mean something in our every day lives and let our fellow men learn from your example.

BAD BLOOD FOR SALE

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, for some years it has been well established that blood from paid donors carries a higher risk of infecting recipients with hepatitis than does blood from voluntary donors. In view of this fact, the Food and Drug Administration recently proposed that such blood be labeled as to its source so that physicians and patients who use the blood would know that they are running this additional risk.

In a stunning example of current administration policy, the Council on Wage and Price Stability has objected to this proposal as being anticompetitive. This objection has brought a sobering response from the Department of Community Services of the AFL-CIO which I am today inserting in the RECORD for the interest and use of the Members:

JANUARY 20, 1976.

Mr. WILLIAM E. SIMON,
Secretary of the Treasury,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SECRETARY SIMON: I should like to call your attention to the comments of the Council on Wage and Price Stability on whole blood and red blood cells submitted to the Food and Drug Administration on January 15.

The Council states, at the very outset, that "the incidence rate of post-transfusion hepatitis associated with blood from paid donors (blood from "commercial" blood banks) is substantially higher than the incidence rate associated with other blood."

The Council states, further, that "such information should (not) be kept from patients, their relatives, and their physicians."

In fact, according to the Council, it generally "views with favor regulations, such as the proposed one, that increase the amount of information available to consumers at relatively little cost."

What are the regulations proposed by FDA? The FDA proposes to adopt regulations to require that whole blood and red blood cells: (1) bear a statement distinguishing blood from volunteer donors and blood from paid donors, and (2) a warning that blood collected from paid donors is associated with a higher risk of transmitting hepatitis.

Since the Council agrees (a) that the risk from paid blood is substantially higher, and (b) that this information should be made available to everybody concerned, why not leave well enough alone?

In these inflationary times, what compulsion drove the Council to waste staff time and tax dollars to produce a ten-page document designed to deny the very conclusions it reached on page two?

In a period of high unemployment and high prices, what compulsion drove the Council to spend time on a program which, under the worst conditions, could have only a minimal impact on inflation?

Is it possible that, under the cloak of the Council on Wage and Price Stability Act of 1974, the four signatories to the document are giving aid and comfort to the commercial blood interests—thereby frustrating recent efforts by the Federal establishment, including the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, to develop a national, rational voluntary blood system?

The effect, of course, is the same. Here is why:

The document questions the "humanitarian and altruistic" reasons of volunteer blood donors. Now I don't know how the Council managed to arrive at this suspicion, but it is my guess that people who give their blood free, but not tax exempt, to friends, family, fellow-workers, soldiers, sailors and strangers are discharging a community responsibility in a humanitarian and altruistic fashion. Are these volunteer blood donors less humanitarian than philanthropists who take tax deductions for their gifts to charity? The tax deduction may be an incentive—but it is hardly an act of selfishness.

After denigrating voluntary donations as less than humanitarian and altruistic because they "have been given to replace blood used by friends or relatives . . . or to insure against their families' possible future blood requirement," the document makes the unique point that "these people also have a great incentive to conceal their experiences with hepatitis." What an incredible statement! Does your Council seriously believe that people would deliberately take chances with the health, welfare and very life of their friends and relatives? Would volunteer donors "conceal their experiences with hepatitis" and risk the lives of their parents and children?

But the signatories to the Council statement keep going. Since "not all commercial blood is associated with a high risk of hepatitis . . . it would be misleading to patients and physicians," they state, "to require a label on all blood from paid donors . . ." How else would they separate "high risk" from "low-risk" blood? Would you eliminate commercial blood altogether since your Council does not question the premise that blood from "commercial blood banks" is riskier than "other blood?"

Apparently, you would not. While you see the appropriateness in an "appeal to humanitarian motives and other lofty ideals," you do not see any dividends in such an approach. On the contrary, your Council states

squarely that "blood is a product that is not very different from other consumer goods." Does the Council mean such consumer goods as hearts, kidneys and corneas? Or does the Council mean such consumer goods as yachts, limousines and summer places? Aside from the fact that blood is human tissue and not just another "consumer product," how hard-boiled, hard-headed and hard-nosed must one become to achieve distinction in our bureaucracy? One could have guessed that the Council's cavalier dismissal of "humanitarian motives and other lofty ideals" would have led it to equate human blood with "other consumer goods," and to proclaim that "no blood is free," even if given voluntarily or altruistically. Here, after delving into the simplicities of amateur economics, the Council comes up with the unusual discovery that it takes money to raise blood, that it takes effort to encourage volunteers. So what's new? It takes money to raise money. This statement springs from the same source which produced that all-time profundity that "there is no free lunch."

Your Council states accurately that the "public is largely unaware of the risks and quality of transfused blood, while physicians and hospitals do not have enough incentive to search for quality blood." The reasons should be obvious to anyone who will look. Over the years, there were people, like the signatories to the Council statements, who preferred to rationalize and justify higher-risk "commercial" blood banks than to promote their complete elimination. In another part of the statement, the four signatories questioned the wisdom of "sole reliance" on voluntary blood. "Thus far," they say, "the United States has had to rely on commercial blood banks." That's right—but only because they and people like them have done nothing to develop an all volunteer blood system. That's right—because an all volunteer system has never been tried. These are the same kind of people who are fond of saying that Rome wasn't built in a day—but I have always suspected that those people never helped to build Rome in the first place.

Now it is the Council's view, according to the statement, that "competition between suppliers, both commercial as well as non-profit . . . should be encouraged." In the words of Oscar Wilde, the Council appears to know the price of everything but the value of nothing. Human blood is not big business—and should not be tossed lightly into the marketplace. It is a gift of God—a gift to be shared with all God's children, whenever and wherever they need it. Or is this too "lofty an idea" for the "practical people" of the Council?

I suppose so—since the Council's official statement suggests that blood donors "could be paid in order to make it worthwhile to give at the most needed times." It is a sad commentary on our society when an official body of the U.S. Government recommends that blood donors be paid when it is well known that most paid donors—if not all—sell their blood simply because they feel they have no other way of earning a few dollars—for food or for drink or whatever. One would expect a more compassionate approach to needy American citizens by their Government—like full employment, a rational welfare program, national health security and, yes, even food stamps. The chiselers, Mr. Secretary, are those who would suck such blood from the poor for a few pennies rather than those who are compelled, by circumstances beyond their control, to resort to food stamps.

It is in this mean spirit that the Council statement descends to recommending that "blood that is associated with a higher risk of hepatitis . . . need not (be) excluded from the competitive market . . . (since) such blood would be safe for use in treating patients, such as many hemophiliacs, who have already had serum hepatitis and who are

therefore immune to the disease . . ." Aside from the fact that there are some professional differences about the finality of the Council's "conclusions," how would they organize this bargain basement business in blood? And wouldn't it be better—and safer—to obtain low-risk blood from millions of potential volunteers who have never—or hardly ever—been reached?

Hemophiliacs, the Council states, "would be encouraged to use such (possibly tainted) blood by its lower prices." Donning the mantle of the consumer advocate, the four signatories to the Council statement are suggesting something new: cut-rate human relationships, devotion at a discount, varying qualities of the essence of brother's keeper bottled in different sizes at different prices. God save us!

What, in the final analysis, is the burden of the Council's statement? In the Council's own words, it is this:

"Contrary to what is implied by the National Blood Policy (that means, from the White House through HEW to the American Blood Commission during the past three years) increased commercialism may be the most appropriate way to alleviate the inefficiencies, shortages, and poor quality of product that currently pervade blood programs in the United States."

And the Council's statement concludes with this observation: "Surely there must be instances where marginally inferior blood is preferable to no blood at all." This, I suppose, is true enough—but only if one believes that a case of syphilis is better than no sex at all. It is such thinking that is responsible for much of our misery—the kind of thinking that refers to millions of our volunteer blood donors, as the statement does on page five, as the "wealthier" portion of the population. Their wealth can be matched only by the statement's wisdom.

However, since the four signatories are not known to be blood experts, one wonders whom they consulted, what materials they read and how they reached their conclusions.

The Council's statement should be withdrawn—with an apology to the American people.

Sincerely,

LEO PERLIS,
Director, Department of Community Services.

STUDY QUESTIONS METRO BENEFITS

HON. ROMANO L. MAZZOLI
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. MAZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, following is the summary chapter and recommendations from a study of Metro conducted by the Library of Congress at the request of myself and my distinguished colleague from Connecticut (Mr. McKINNEY) as chairman and ranking minority member of the House District Subcommittee on Fiscal Affairs.

Questions are being raised from many corners about the cost-effectiveness of the Metro-rail system now under construction. Some of the participating jurisdictions in the Washington area are expressing reservations about further funding for Metro in view of the soaring cost of construction and the multimillion dollar operating deficits.

Furthermore, many Capitol Hill friends of Metro have publicly retreated from their earlier unquestioning support

of the construction of the full 98-mile Metro system.

Under these circumstances, I—who also share these concerns and doubts about Metro—believe the House Members should have an opportunity to examine the Library of Congress report.

The report has been soundly denounced by Metro officials, Members of Congress, and other local Government officials. Others cite it with approval.

Be that as it may, whether one agrees or disagrees with the study's conclusions, it makes an important contribution to the debate on Metro.

The report is too lengthy for inclusion in the Record in its entirety, but those Members who wish to read the entire report can obtain a copy by calling our subcommittee office at 5-1615.

The report follows:

STUDY QUESTIONS METRO BENEFITS

IX. SUMMARY

Since its inception, Washington's METRO has enjoyed considerable popular support. The vision of travel in a comfortable, air-conditioned, high speed public facility compared favorably with that of crowded roads, noisy traffic, and polluted air. Furthermore, in the long-run METRO promised a way to restructure development within the area so that automobiles were less essential.

Even though concerns about congestion and the environment have greater basis today than ever before, there is increasing evidence that suggests questioning at this juncture whether the benefits of the full METRO system outweigh its costs. This evidence is of essentially three types: shifts in the area's overall growth and developmental patterns, escalation in the capital costs of building METRO, and the prospect of substantial operating deficits in future years. There is also mounting evidence that METRO, as planned, may not be well suited to the requirements of one potential user group that is likely to need it most—persons without automobiles.

The 98-mile Adopted Regional METRO system approved by Congress in 1969 was based on the premise that urban growth and travel could be channeled in a coordinated, mutually supportive pattern. Since its adoption, however, a number of events have reshaped the key assumptions in that premise. The use of automobiles has generally continued to rise and, with the exception of a slight upturn in 1973, public transport patronage has continued to erode and remains beneath 1970 levels. The wedge and corridor planning concepts which were anticipated to bring concentrations of population, employment, and commerce within reach of METRO stations have not developed and do not appear likely to develop. Indeed, local zoning policy in many of the area's jurisdictions is adamantly opposed to intense development in the neighborhood of METRO stations. New transportation facilities, such as the Shirley Highway bus on freeway, have come to play major roles in the area's public transport. Increased public awareness of the environment, parking, traffic, and developmental implications of METRO have highlighted problems of the original plan and have generated numerous proposals for route realignments, most notably in the Silver Spring, College Park, and Anacostia areas.

Only recently has the problem of public transport operating subsidies come to be fully realized in the Washington area. With a fiscal year 1976 operating deficit for METRO bus operations expected to be in excess of \$53 million, the jurisdictions in the region might well question whether METRO rail service will compound or alleviate the need for further public transport subsidies.

Furthermore, recognition of the fiscal im-

plications of METRO has given rise to questions concerning the priority of this project compared with other public projects. The total costs of building the rail system, when conceived, were estimated to be under half of what they are now anticipated to be. At the same time the Washington area, like most of the nation's major metropolitan areas, has experienced a sharp decline in the growth rates of earlier decades. Thus, there are more costs to pay, fewer than projected passengers to carry, and a smaller than expected population base to support the project. These changes are of sufficient magnitude to call into question the merits of constructing the full system at this time.

This study explores some of the changes in the Washington region's growth and activity patterns which have occurred since METRO was conceived as well as shifts in the projected costs of building and operating the system. An analysis of alternative systems is conducted to explore whether the 98-mile Adopted Regional System is the most efficient way to provide the area's public transport.

Three possible alternative rail systems are selected for examination. These are:

Alternative I—a minimum rail system of 41 miles incorporating only those segments where construction is now underway.

Alternative II—an intermediate rail system of 68 miles.

Alternative III—the 98-mile Adopted Regional System.

Considering the time and resource limitations of this preliminary study, the procedures employed in this analysis necessarily involved making some assumptions and judgments which are discussed in the body of the report. It is felt that the procedures employed were objective and reasonable, and that the results reached give rise to some serious questions about the relative merits of the 98-mile Adopted Regional System.

The results of the analysis of these three systems are shown in Table 27. These results are based on the findings of Chapter III-VI, and the reader is referred to those sections for supporting details and assumptions.

From the Table, it is clear that both capital costs and operating deficits tend to increase as the size of the rail system increases. Estimated capital costs range from \$3.3 billion for the shortest rail system analyzed up to \$5.5 billion for the largest alternative considered. Estimated 1990 operating deficits range from \$13 million for the shortest rail alternative considered to nearly 5 times that much for the 98-mile ARS. Furthermore, these deficits assume that operating costs remain constant, in real terms, between now and 1990, an assumption which probably understates future operating costs when it is considered that real transit labor costs and real energy costs, two key inputs to urban public transportation operating costs, have risen in real terms in recent years. The deficit figures shown also reflect an assumption that fares will remain unchanged, in real terms, from now to 1990. This assumption may also understate operating deficits, since political pressures tend to inhibit increases in rapid transit fares.¹

Table 27 does not highlight the incremental merits of expanding the METRO rail system, however. Rather, it examines the average costs, revenues, and patronage of the three alternatives. If instead we look at the additional costs and additional patronage which result from extending the system beyond the portion already under construction (i.e., beyond Alternative I), then the relative merits of extending the METRO rail

system appear considerably more questionable.

TABLE 27.—SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF METRO RAIL ALTERNATIVES (FOR THE YEAR 1990)

Alternative	I	II	III
Description	Includes portions now under construction	Intermediate system	98-mile adopted regional system
Length (miles)	41	68	98
Number of stations	46	62	82
Capital cost (billions) ¹	\$3.294	\$4.358	\$5.500
Operating cost (millions) ²	\$53.5	\$88.8	\$127.9
Revenues (millions) ²	\$40.4	\$53.6	\$64.6
Trips (millions per year)	100.1	130.2	153.0
Passengers per average weekday (thousands of round trips)	175	228	268
Annual operating deficit (millions) ²	\$13.1	\$35.2	\$63.3
Operating deficit per trip ²	.13	.27	.41
Capital cost per average weekday passenger ¹	\$18,823	\$19,114	\$20,522

¹ In escalated dollars as used WMATA.

² In 1976 dollars.

Table 28 examines the incremental operating deficits, capital costs, and patronage which are associated with building and operating the systems described here as Alternative II and Alternative III. The second column of Table 28 shows the extra operating deficits, capital costs, and patronage generated by Alternative II, assuming that Alternative I were already built and operating. Similarly, the rightmost column shows the corresponding characteristics for Alternative II on the assumption that Alternative II is already in place. The advantage of computing the costs and patronage figures on this basis is that they permit the relative performance of rail system extensions to be viewed by themselves, without the characteristics of the minimum system being averaged in. As apparent from Table 28, the operating deficit per trip for Alternative I, the minimum system, is 13 cents, while the additional deficit per additional trip implicit in Alternative II, the intermediate system, is 73 cents. Similarly, the extra trips and extra operating deficits generated by selecting Alternative III, the ARS, over Alternative II, the intermediate system, result in additional deficits per additional trip of \$1.23.

It should also be noted the primary beneficiaries of system extension, especially from Alternative II to Alternative III, tend to be areas with considerably higher than average income.

It is difficult to estimate what impacts the smaller rail system might have on automobile traffic and bus volumes. One plausible set of assumptions set out in the report suggests that the increase in traffic caused by going from Alternative III to Alternative I is under two percent, equivalent to about a third of a year's growth at recent traffic growth rates. The corresponding effect on bus operations is estimated to be an increase in patronage of about three percent. The effect of curtailment on rail system costs and operations appears likely to outweigh the adverse impacts created on other modes.

The specific network alternatives analyzed here are preliminary; detailed design considerations and local transportation and development policies would undoubtedly require considerable revision of such network concepts to make them fully acceptable. However, the results of this analysis suggest that alternative rail networks with less mileage than the Adopted Regional System could produce comparable net benefits for a lesser amount of public resource commitment.

TABLE 28.—INCREMENTAL EFFECTS OF RAIL SYSTEM EXPANSION BEYOND PORTIONS NOW UNDER CONSTRUCTION (FOR THE YEAR 1990)

	Increment on which characteristics are computed	Alternative I (minimal system)	Alternative I to alternative II	Alternative II to alternative III
Additional capital cost (billions) ¹		\$3.294	\$1.064	\$1.142
Additional operating deficit (millions) ²		\$13.1	\$22.1	\$28.1
Additional trips (millions/year)		100.1	30.1	22.8
Additional passengers per average weekday (thousands of round trips)		175	53	40
Incremental operating deficit per trip ²		.13	.73	1.23
Incremental capital cost per average weekday passenger ¹		\$18,823	\$20,075	\$28,550

¹ In "escalated dollars" as used by WMATA.

² In 1976 dollars.

CONCLUSIONS OF THE ADVISORY PANEL

An advisory panel was assembled for the study reported above. Its purpose was to suggest questions which the study should address as well as to recommend procedures for answering them. This panel met on two occasions during the course of the study to discuss findings and to review draft sections of the report. In view of the preliminary evaluation of METRO rail systems set out in the attached report, the advisory panel feels that the following conclusions are justified.

(1) Enough serious questions currently exist concerning the relative merits of the 98-mile METRO rail system to warrant a thorough alternatives analysis prior to proceeding to construct new segments of that system. Any further federal project approvals should be premised upon this careful alternatives analysis. In our view, simply requiring that new projects represent "operable segments" as called for in the recent Federal Budget may not provide adequate assurance that the fraction of the system thus built will reflect reasonable overall transport priorities. We understand that deferring further decisions on new METRO rail construction may lead to delays in construction of some system segments, but do not feel that substantial hardship would be created by delaying further construction by six to nine months, while the benefits to the rail system which finally emerge could be considerable. In essence, it is a question of whether rational priorities or fiscal constraints whose implications are poorly understood will dictate the final design of METRO. In our judgment, the potential gains of a systematic approach more than outweigh the cost and inconvenience of the associated delay. Of special concern in this regard is the Addison Road Branch which is just now entering the construction contract stage.

The alternatives analysis recommended here should be conducted in greater depth than that consonant with the resource limitations of the investigation presented in the preceding report. It is also essential that the alternatives analysis be undertaken with more objective oversight than has characterized previous Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission Net Income Analyses.

Part of this analysis should be an objective and thorough review of the expected costs of operating alternative METRO rail systems and the revenues likely to be produced by them. This review should identify the fare levels needed for break-even operations of bus and rail services. Recognizing that political prerogatives tend to inhibit fare increases, this examination should also identify

¹ A ten cent fare in 1940 would correspond, in real terms, to a 38 cent fare in 1975 if the Bureau of Labor Statistics' Consumer Price Index is used as a basis.

the subsidy requirements if fares remain unchanged at current levels.

(2) Upon completion of the alternatives analysis, there would be a sounder basis for determining what the future federal posture with respect to METRO should be. At that point, an indication of the total federal commitment to METRO could be made and state and local jurisdictions could re-evaluate their system plans and financial arrangements accordingly.

(3) In preparation for this reassessment, regional and local planning agencies should intensively review the development pressures that are likely to accompany METRO rail system expansion, as well as the level of development required to make METRO service a reasonable public investment. This review should address parking and commercial and residential development, and should indicate the compatibility of the level of development thus projected with local planning objectives and zoning regulations.

(4) In light of the much greater involvement of public funds that have been and seem likely to be needed in order to construct and operate the METRO rail system, especially those which are of federal origin, a more careful determination should also be made at the amount and incidence of expected non-farebox benefits and unrecoverable costs of METRO rail throughout the Washington metropolitan area. Such a determination should take into consideration the trip types and user groups who would be the chief beneficiaries of METRO and should identify them on a jurisdictional basis, as well as developmental, environmental, and other non-user benefits stemming from METRO rail service. The cooperative forecasting process now underway at the Council of Governments forms a logical starting point for such an examination, and COG may be the appropriate agency to conduct it.

Members of the Advisory Panel:
Damian J. Kulash, Vice President, Jack Faucett Associates, Inc. (Study Director).

W. Bruce Allen, Associate Professor of Regional Science and Transportation, University of Pennsylvania.

Alan Altshuler, Professor of Political Science, Urban Studies, and Planning, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

James R. Nelson, Charles E. Merrill Professor of Economics, Amherst College.

Robert A. Nelson, Transportation Consultant.

Martin Wohl, Professor of Transportation System Planning, Carnegie-Mellon University.

BARON DE KALB—REVOLUTIONARY WAR HERO

HON. ELLIOTT H. LEVITAS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. LEVITAS. Mr. Speaker, as America prepares to celebrate her Bicentennial, our focus quite naturally turns to our history, and one inescapable fact emerges. The genius of our settlement and development as a nation has been our peculiar ability to attract the interest, devotion, and commitment of many from other countries—men and women who have believed in the promise of America and who have sacrificed to insure its fulfillment. France's Marquis de Lafayette made an inestimable contribution as a general and diplomat; Prussia's Baron Von Steuben was largely responsible for instilling military discipline in the Continental Army; Poland's

Count Pulaski was the successful and valuable commander of a cavalry unit. The list continues, and in our Bicentennial Year we will reflect with gratitude on the contributions of these volunteers from overseas.

In my own State of Georgia there is a strong sense of identification with the Revolutionary period in which Georgia patriots played a vital role; a sense of identification which recognizes the contributions made by European volunteers.

And in all of Georgia there is no area more concerned about the matter than De Kalb County, in my district, where the Baron De Kalb Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, have inaugurated a research program with the object of setting straight the facts, in the best interests of American historical tradition.

Georgia was spared some of the early ravages of the Revolution, in that no fighting took place there until 1778; but once begun it proceeded at a gallop. British forces attacking along the coast from Florida seized Savannah in December 1778, and Sunbury and Augusta the following month. By December 1779, every important city and town in the State had fallen to British control, and the Colonial Militia, under Gen. Robert Howe, had been driven from the State into South Carolina.

Georgia's greatest weakness lay within. Not that there were not patriots there in quantity, for surely there were. And not that they were lacking in ability; for surely they were able, in high degree. It was simply that a large element within the State—particularly in the hill country, in the settled and populated areas in the central and western counties—was friendly to the crown and opposed to independence. Wherever patriot support appeared in quantity in Georgia it was matched by Tory sentiment of equal, or almost equal strength. The Whig Party, thoroughly in control in many States, was by no means as formidable in Georgia, and help was clearly needed in the patriots' struggle to drive the British from the place. Luckily for Georgia and luckily for the patriot cause, help was forthcoming in the person of the notable Baron Johann De Kalb, a soldier of remarkable ability, for whom De Kalb County, Ga., is named.

Baron De Kalb was one of the more colorful figures in the patriot army. The title of "Baron" had no relationship to reality. It was a wholly pretended claim to royalty, required by the fact that no one was capable of obtaining an officer's commission in a European army, in the 18th century, unless he was of royal birth—or at least said that he was. Johann Kalb, of Huttendorf, Germany was of humble peasant background. He had left the farm to take a job as a waiter before deciding, finally, that his major purpose must be military. When the War of the Austrian Succession began, in 1740, Johann Kalb was already established as a lieutenant in Count Lowendal's regiment of French infantry, opposing the interests of Austria and Britain. It was then that he assumed the name of Baron De Kalb. By 1747, with

the war still in progress, he had risen to the rank of captain and adjutant, serving also an officer of detail—a post combining the offices of general manager and judge of the regiment.

Opposition to British purposes became the guiding aspect of De Kalb's way of life. When France again opposed England in the Seven Years' War he rose to major, fighting for the French cause, and when the American Colonies first showed signs of restiveness under the authority of England, in the 1760's, he undertook a secret mission to America, in behalf of the Duc De Choiseul, to report back on worsening political conditions there.

Arriving in Philadelphia in January 1768, he traveled in the Colonies about 4 months. His numerous and detailed reports were the observation of a shrewd and impartial investigator. With the accession of Louis XVI, the French Government began edging toward more of an official interest in the American-British dispute, and De Kalb was a leader in the movement. By the time the American Revolution had begun in earnest, De Kalb was a major general in the French army, and in this capacity sought direct entrance to the American military cause, in company with another French officer of note, his protegee, Gilbert du Motier, Marquis de Lafayette.

After numerous delays attending their attempt to leave Europe, the two officers sailed in April 1777, landing in June on the coast of South Carolina. Commissioned major general in the American Army, De Kalb entered combat near Philadelphia, in command of a division of New England troops. Shortly afterwards he withdrew, in company with his division, to Valley Forge.

The performance of General De Kalb in America was less than brilliant for many months owing to his various assignments to areas devoid of major action. At times he wanted to return to the French army, at others to become the French envoy to America. He also had dreams of representing France in Geneva. But nothing came of these possibilities. In 1778 he was Lafayette's second in command in the ill-starred Canadian expedition. Until 1780 he was constantly with the army, although without the conspicuous distinction for which he had hoped.

With the British besieging Charleston, S.C., in April 1780, De Kalb was ordered to relieve the city. In this endeavor he was joined by Gen. Horatio Gates, recently appointed to command in the South. Near Saunders' Creek, the combined American forces encountered the army of Lord Cornwallis. The first attack of the British scattered the Virginia and North Carolina militia who, in company with General Gates, fled the battlefield. But De Kalb, commanding the right wing, held firm. Moreover, to the amazement of all observers, he counterattacked, charging the enemy on three separate occasions. The action became known as the battle of Camden.

In the hand-to-hand fighting the issue of the battle of Camden was long in doubt. When the American position became hopeless, De Kalb led his last remaining men in a final charge—an ac-

tion that was to cost him his life. Mortally wounded and bleeding profusely, he fell, and his surviving soldiers retreated. Three days later, on August 19, 1780, he died at Camden a hero of the Revolution.

Some 45 years later in 1824-25, De Kalb's good friend the Marquis de Lafayette visited the United States on a triumphal tour. It has been observed that rarely if ever has the gratitude of a republic been more signally displayed than it was on this occasion amounting to a long series of honors and ovals. Few of the countless invitations received by Lafayette, in this glorious hour, touched him more deeply than that received from the town of Camden, to perform the pious office of laying the cornerstone of a monument to De Kalb. The duty was performed by Lafayette with touching reverence for the deceased and words of praise for a brave friend and brother officer.

In calling attention to the sterling performance of Baron De Kalb, the Baron De Kalb Chapter, NSDAR, deserves the respect of patriots throughout the land. It is well to remember at this time, in our Bicentennial celebration, that our Revolution had the blessings of democratic people throughout the world.

It still has today.

Two centuries' time is not enough to dull the luster of so noble an undertaking, which shall live in the memory of patriots so long as memory prevails.

AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, agricultural trade has its roots in the founding of this great country. Trade restrictions played a major role in bringing about the American Revolution. In this Bicentennial Year, the American farmer is again faced with the prospects of trade restrictions. At the same time that the American farmer has worked to reduce inflation through increased production, some are calling for restrictions on exports under the banner of "cheap food."

Gary Seevers, Commissioner, Commodity Futures Trading Commission, recently spoke on the need to continue a liberal trade policy. His timely remarks address the benefits of the free market system in both domestic and international trade. His review of agricultural trade history places the issues in perspective. If we understand the pitfalls of the restrictive policies of the past, we are more likely to avoid restrictive trade policies in the future.

Mr. Seevers discusses the limits of the use of food power. Too often, policymakers have taken our agricultural production machine for granted. Too often, the policymakers have attempted to use food as a tool of diplomacy without any thought to the cost to the farmer or the

cost to our own moral principles. Mr. Seevers' timely and forthright article provides for a better understanding of the value of agricultural trade.

Mr. Seevers' address follows:
AMERICAN AGRICULTURAL TRADE POLICY UNDER STRESS

(Remarks by Gary L. Seevers before the Bicentennial Symposium on American Agriculture, Oregon State University, Corvallis, Oreg.)

A discussion of U.S. agricultural trade raises completely different questions today than as recently as five years ago. If one were to look at American agriculture in an international context five years ago, and several decades before that, here is the picture that would emerge and how it would compare with today.

1. Five years ago U.S. agriculture was plagued with chronic surpluses. A few other exporting countries had surpluses as well but they carried a minor share of the surplus burden. Today there are no big surpluses.

2. Our abundance was a national problem. The Government attempted to deal with the surpluses by paying producers not to produce. Acreage diversion payments exceeded \$3 billion for several years. Today there are no acreage diversion programs and the cost of remaining price support programs is minimal.

3. Farm income was not high enough to hold and expand resources in agriculture. Today income is more favorable to investment and employment in agriculture.

4. Many factors led to the earlier unhappy state of affairs. Trade barriers abroad were a major cause. Many foreign markets were simply closed except for residual import needs that depended very little on the competitiveness of our products. Where markets were open the overvalued dollar put an effective surcharge on our agricultural exports. Today the dollar is valued at its market price and trade barriers are important in a new sense. Today's problem is that trade barriers in other countries insulate their markets from year-to-year fluctuations in worldwide supply and demand. The U.S. market must therefore absorb most of the shocks from throughout the world.

5. Five years ago the United States was the residual supplier for the world. Crop shortfalls were rather easily absorbed from our surpluses and the price consequences in our markets were minimal. Today we are still the shock absorber for the world, but shocks seem bigger and must be absorbed in our domestic markets, with more price repercussions.

6. Five years ago purchases by Communist countries from free-world countries were exceptional and practically none were being made from the United States. Today their orders have become the rule rather than the exception although the magnitudes are still very erratic.

7. Ten years ago, in the mid-1960's, poor countries were poorly fed and many were heavily dependent on the United States for food-aid under P.L. 480. Today they are still poorly fed. In the meantime our P.L. 480 program has gone through several stages. The program was scaled down in the late 1960's when the Green Revolution seemed to be solving the food production problem in developing countries. It then became almost purely a tool of foreign policy. As Congress slashed away at general foreign aid, the Administration latched onto P.L. 480 as a substitute in foreign diplomacy. In one year almost all P.L. 480 shipments went to Indochina. P.L. 480 then became the victim of the fight against food inflation and efforts to control Federal spending. In the past 18 months, P.L. 480 shipments have become more generous again and today we are supplying about 60 percent of worldwide food-aid. Nonetheless, today, P.L. 480 accounts for

little more than 5 percent of our exports. Ten years ago it was one-third of the total.

In going from the old situation to the present, the common denominator has been U.S. agricultural trade. In recent years there has been a marked shift by both Communist countries and Third World countries toward more food imports from the developed countries. And the United States has been raising its share of the grain exports shipped from developed countries. From the 1969-1971 period to the 1973-1975 period we supplied 84 tons of every 100-ton increase in world grain exports.

Not only is U.S. agricultural trade bigger in the world context today than 5 years ago, it is bigger when it comes to U.S. international economic relations in total, and when it comes to our economy here at home. Of course, agricultural trade has always been important to this country. But something brand new may be happening with respect to agricultural trade policy.

For most of this nation's 200 year history, agricultural trade policy has been a relatively safe and stable compartment of national affairs. We have consistently favored freer international trade and especially free and expanded trade in agricultural products.

Our policy positions have followed quite naturally from two factors. The first was our national commitment to a free enterprise economy that emphasized individual initiative and accomplishment. The second factor was pure economics—our long-term comparative advantage in agricultural production. From the earliest days of the American colonies to modern American agriculture, agricultural exports have been in our national interest.

Today, however, the basic assumptions of our long-term agricultural export policy are being questioned more fundamentally than perhaps they have ever been before. Agricultural trade policy is no longer in a safe, stable compartment of national affairs. One reason is domestic inflation. Complaints about high and rising food prices have raised doubts in many minds about the desirability of greater agricultural exports. A second reason is simply the loss of confidence in the value of free markets domestically. The third reason is that popular support for a liberal overall international trade policy seems to be vanishing. If that umbrella goes, it will be hard to continue a free agricultural export policy.

From that early commitment to the principle of free trade, the United States has continued to pursue liberal trade between nations, and to seek easier access to markets for her agricultural exports abroad.

The path has not always been smooth. The free trade policy has always been subject to attack from special interest groups. Nevertheless, the free trade commitment has been more consistently followed than most of our national policies over a comparably long period of time.

The last time the U.S. political system rejected the free trade principle in a major way was during the tariff wars of the 1920's and 1930's. Along with generally unsound monetary and fiscal policies, the tariff wars helped bring on the Great Depression.

Like most traumatic episodes caused by policy errors, at least in a democracy, the seeds of correction were sown in the episode itself. Public and Congressional reaction in favor of free trade produced legislation in 1934 that provided the foundation for America's world economic leadership during the ensuing 40 years.

AGRICULTURE AND FREE TRADE

The United States also backed away—somewhat inadvertently—from free trade in agricultural products during that traumatic period of the 1930's. The nation lost faith in the ability of free markets to effectively organize and reward agricultural produc-

tion. We turned to government price supports and land control programs instead.

We still favored agricultural exports during the period that followed but found that our domestic agricultural programs forced the use of duties and quotas to restrict imports, and various kinds of subsidy programs to maintain our exports.

Over the years, government management of U.S. agriculture was found to be relatively ineffective. We made poor use of our agricultural resources. The government programs raised production costs by idling acres, hampering private management and discouraging desirable economic adjustments.

We also found that our use of agricultural import barriers and export subsidies encouraged other nations to adopt similar techniques.

Both the higher production costs and the proliferation of trade barriers hampered export market growth.

The conflict between our liberal trade policy and our managed agriculture helped turn the United States back toward a market-oriented farm policy starting in the mid-1960's. The surge in exports that followed pushed exports from \$5 to \$6 billion annually during the 1960's to the \$22-\$23 billion level today. Farm exports are now the nation's largest single source of foreign earnings, and a major underpinning of the dollar in foreign exchange markets.

Despite the obvious importance of our agricultural exports, and our long commitment to liberal trade, agricultural trade policy is currently in a state of some disarray. Fundamental questions are being raised about both free trade in general and agricultural exports in particular.

The support for liberal trade has always had to come from the general public because it was usually opposed by special interest groups. Today, the public support has been weakened by fears of inflation and examples of trade intervention by dozens of countries around the world. The success of OPEC makes cartels look attractive. The 40 percent increase in U.S. food prices in the last three years has raised consumer doubts about the wisdom of unlimited agricultural exports. And after the Soviet buying spree, people question the ability of free markets to deal effectively with centrally-planned economies. Much of the Third World is pushing for an entirely new world economic order.

All of these developments have given ammunition to critics of free international trade.

It is true that the U.S. is proceeding with the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations. But the arguments in favor of free trade are rarely heard in public. Our free trade commitment is suffering from "benign neglect."

IS TRADE LIBERALIZATION STILL GOOD POLICY?

There are two basic paths this nation's trade policy can take today. One is to continue our efforts to liberalize trade between nations. The alternative is to move toward an administered world economy, with trade terms settled between governments.

The choice is much like the one facing us in our overall national economic policy—the basic choice between reliance on the discipline of markets or reliance on the discipline of government. As an economist and an ordinary citizen, I come down on the side of market discipline. But that would take me into a semi-theological issue.

The point is that, broadly speaking, the choices facing us are mutually dependent. If we go toward more government management domestically, we probably will internationally also. And if we do, it surely will alter not only agricultural trade but also the structure of our agricultural system.

So, is a policy based on the standards of free trade internationally a good policy? To me the case for trade liberalization is as strong as it ever was. In fact, improvements in transportation and communications are

probably making it stronger than ever. And the arguments against trade liberalization are just as short-sighted and heavily oriented to special interests as ever.

I may not have glowing expectations for the Tokyo Round of trade negotiations, but the effort to liberalize trade is just as worthwhile as it has ever been.

Let me turn to some of the questions being asked which demonstrate that our liberal agricultural trade policy has become exposed.

1. Should there be U.S. government grain reserves to moderate fluctuations in domestic farm and food prices?

Clearly there are costs to both producers and consumers from unstable prices. If greater stability could be achieved with government grain reserves at small expense, it would be hard to argue against the idea. However, there are several reasons to doubt the efficacy of government reserves for purposes of price stabilization.

First, government reserves would probably turn out to largely substitute for holdings that would otherwise be held in private U.S. hands and in the importing countries. These private holdings currently are quite large, especially by farmers. I suspect that if the other nations of the world were really convinced that the U.S. would no longer hold their reserves for free, their holdings would increase substantially too.

The second problem is whether the U.S. government would really manage its reserves in a disciplined fashion. History shows it is all too easy for policy-makers to succumb to short-run political pressures, building stocks too high and releasing them too soon.

The third problem is that any price stabilizing benefits that actually are achieved would be partly exported to world markets. Either the United States would have to be willing to pay the costs of providing worldwide stability or we would have to institute some form of export management to insulate our markets. It is for this latter reason that U.S. grain reserves are potentially contrary to a free agricultural trade policy. Finally, in the long run, government-held reserves probably would lead us back into high price supports, then into surplus management and finally back into conflict with free trade.

2. Should the United States give higher priority to food aid? It is sometimes argued that everyone in the world has a basic right to an adequate diet, and that food-aid should be given priority over cash exports. In addition to presuming that the government should have a heavier hand in the export business, this view attributes more to food-aid than is warranted.

Food-aid has helped various nations through serious food emergencies. On the other hand, food-aid has seriously discouraged agricultural development in Third World nations.

Beyond that, bilateral agreements which have any content build rigidities into trade relations and make trade flows less flexible to changing economic circumstances. They also presume more government involvement in commercial trade than has been true in the past, especially in a tight year when quantitative commitments to supply might exceed exportable supply.

4. Does that mean our long-term grain agreement with the USSR was a mistake? Not necessarily. The Soviet Union, because of its huge size and its very erratic grain production, has been a powerful destabilizing force in world grain markets. The recently signed agreement adds a stabilizing factor. It will encourage the USSR to accept and store a minimum amount of grain even during good crop years, providing additional buffer stocks for poor crop years.

5. Should the U.S. Government take over agricultural exporting as a public utility? We have an experiment to help answer this

question. Canada's Wheat Marketing Board has achieved a mixed set of reviews. In 1972, they sold all their wheat before the United States did, and at a lower price. The following year they held on too long for too high a price, losing sales and income for their farmers. In both cases they help destabilize grain markets in the process. Government management is far from a guarantee of perfect decision-making.

A government marketing board is also at a serious disadvantage in periods of ample supply, when private firms are out searching for customers.

Perhaps the key consideration is simply efficiency to get the job done. The Canadians have been unable to take much advantage of the growing world demand for grain, while U.S. producers and our grain marketing system have been able to expand exports sharply. This may have something to do with Canada's land and water resources. But, it also has to do with insulating their producers from market demand, with the lack of incentive to put money into export facilities, and with the unreliability of Canadian exports due to labor problems.

6. Should the United States exploit its "food power" as the OPEC nations have done? This question would never be asked by advocates of liberal trade. One really does not have to go beyond pure economics to answer this question. Acting alone we do not have a monopoly position in grain markets even though we have about one-half of world grain exports. The ability to expand production elsewhere is so great that any attempt to monopolize would last a very short time, if at all. And if it did work, it would be to the disadvantage of American producers unless a complicated system was devised to pass the monopoly profits back to them.

Why not form an OPEC (organization of grain exporting countries) with Canada and Australia? Economically it might be "effective" for a while but eventually it would suffer the same fate as if we did it alone.

7. Should U.S. agricultural exports be used for diplomatic leverage in dealings with other countries? It is appealing for agricultural groups to think of their exports as "food power" which enhances the U.S. posture abroad. To the extent we make sales and generate foreign exchange earnings, the benefits are great and our economic position is improved. However, to use food for diplomacy implies taking it away from those who fail to cooperate. To do this would be adverse to domestic producers, thereby discouraging domestic production. It also offends many sensibilities. For many centuries food has been used for political purposes, to maintain governments in power and to expand territories, but to turn our agricultural export capacity over to the use of a Secretary of State does not strike me as a good idea in the 20th Century.

PRIVACY LAWS: A THREAT TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE

HON. WILLIAM S. COHEN

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, on the editorial page of this morning's edition of the Washington Post appeared an article by James Russell Wiggins, former editor of the Post, former U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations and present editor and publisher of the Ellsworth, Maine, American.

Mr. Wiggins has for many months

been concerned about the long-range implications of Federal and State laws that close to the public the arrest records of persons acquitted of crimes and the records of those convicted who have completed prison terms or have been pardoned.

Mr. Wiggins has written many editorials on the issue in his newspaper in Maine, and in today's article he extends the debate on this issue to the National Capital. Mr. Wiggins fears that by sealing criminal records, the privacy laws may work against the public interest in several ways. He is particularly concerned that such laws may forever close to press and public scrutiny a considerable portion of Government activity.

Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of the issues involved and because the House Subcommittee on Civil and Constitutional Rights is now considering legislation on this subject, I urge all my colleagues who have not already done so to read Mr. Wiggins' thought-provoking article.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 15, 1976]

PRIVACY LAWS: A THREAT TO CRIMINAL JUSTICE

(By J. R. Wiggins)

Americans are risking their priceless heritage of a relatively open system of criminal justice that protects them against secret arrest, secret trial and secret punishment, by submitting to the enactment of federal and state laws enforcing privacy upon the arrest records of persons acquitted, and the files of those who have completed prison sentences, and records of those who have been pardoned.

Twenty-eight states have passed varying laws enforcing some degree of concealment, expungement, or sealing of such records. The Tunney subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee held hearings on a sweeping federal statute (S. 2008) last July. The Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has been promulgating regulations requiring the states to conform to concealment guidelines in the circulation of criminal justice information.

In the forefront of this assault upon historic protections against secrecy in the criminal justice system, odd to relate, are the American Civil Liberties Union, and liberal legislators such as Sen. John Tunney and Sen. Edward Kennedy.

The wave of privacy laws being enacted in the states already has brought to two states the reality of secret arrest which Americans have hitherto associated only with fascist and Communist countries.

In Hawaii, in August, 1974, Honolulu police, acting under a privacy statute, refused to release any information about incarcerations or arrests, and the public could not find out the names of those arrested or the offenses with which they were charged. A prosecutor refused to release the names of persons indicted by a grand jury.

Acting under their interpretation of an act lobbied through the Oregon legislature by the American Civil Liberties Union, law officers at the Umatilla county jail at Pendleton, Ore., held 175 persons in jail on Sept. 15, 1975, refusing to acknowledge their presence to relatives and friends or ball bondsmen. On Sept. 17, the Oregon legislature summoned into special session by Gov. Robert W. Straub, hastily repealed the law entirely. In Maine, acting under his interpretation of the Maine expungement statute, the then secretary of state, Joseph Edgar, in November, 1974, directed newspapers in the state to excise from their files records of the arrest and conviction and prison service

of persons pardoned by the governor. (The Maine legislature now is considering legislation to repeal an expungement statute.)

Areyeh Neier, executive director, American Civil Liberties Union, in his testimony before the Tunney subcommittee on July 15 and 16 made a strong appeal for privacy of both arrest and conviction records. He said that only if the victim of an arrest consents should the fact be made public, and he argued that it violates due process to disseminate to the press conviction records "absent the individual's consent." If the press discovers the records, it should be free to publish them, in Neier's view—an empty privilege if laws punish all disclosure of the records. In its current solicitation of funds the ACLU states: "ACLU court cases and legislative action seek to open government actions to public view." S. 2008 and the Oregon, Hawaiian and Maine laws seem singular ways to "open government actions to public view." Neier revives a Blackstonian opinion that freedom of the press consists only of immunity to prior restraint in an age when society, by two centuries of experience, has found that it comprehends (1) the right to get information about government; (2) the right to print without prior restraint; (3) the right to print without fear of punitive punishment; (4) the right to distribute. A press that is deaf and blind, by law, is not able to make effective use of the power of speech.

The state laws already passed, and the agitation launched by ACLU and others, is already, in many practical ways, diminishing the power of the press to fulfill its function as the public's surrogate in the constant scrutiny of the law enforcement process. The extreme interpretation of the Hawaii statute, the Oregon statute, and the Maine statute flow logically from the spirit of the expungement and concealment laws. They give a sanction to secrecy by police and courts. Over time, they will draw about the transactions of the police and the courts a cloak of secrecy that will be so difficult to penetrate that citizens will come to know very little about criminal justice processes.

The very citizens these statutes are intended to protect will have their basic rights imperiled, exposing them to the risk that none will learn of their arrest, scrutinize the conduct of the police and judges who deal with them, or keep alive the just public concern with the conditions of their incarceration. These are all public matters that involve all of society which is interested in seeing that justice is done and injustice is not countenanced.

PINE TREES GROW IN IDAHO'S MINING TUNNELS

HON. STEVEN D. SYMMS

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. SYMMS. Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Agriculture has recently finished consideration of budget levels for the upcoming fiscal year within the Forest Service. A large part of that discussion centered around this Nation's failure to maintain adequate reforestation activities on the national forest system.

In the course of those budget sessions, I ran across an interesting application of technology which has enabled Idaho foresters to grow over 4,000 pine trees deep in the tunnels of Idaho's mining district.

I would like to enter an article of February 12 from the Gazette Record about this accomplishment in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Gazette Record, Feb. 12, 1976]

TREES GROW GREAT 3,000 FEET DOWN AT BUNKER HILL

Deep in the sunless depths of the 90-year old Bunker Hill mine in Kellogg over 4,000 pine trees are growing and thriving in an old, worked out tunnel, located over 3,000 feet underground.

The idea of growing vegetation underground is not new, but this probably marks the first time a mine has been used to produce large quantities of plants for practical application.

Local lore has it that the first plant grown underground was an orange tree which sprang from a seed an unknown miner spit out while several feet underground.

Since that discovery, miners have grown many types of plants underground, including vegetables and flowers, even fruit trees, often with spectacular results. The plants are easy to care for requiring only occasional fertilizer, water and the light supplied by incandescent bulbs. Only recently has the potential for large scale production been explored.

Last year, Bunker Hill, a subsidiary of Gulf Resources and Chemical Corporation, launched a massive program to revegetate 18,000 acres of land near Kellogg which had suffered many years of environmental insult from both nature and man. Over 45,000 trees were planted last spring. Millions more are scheduled to be planted in the next 10 years.

The revegetation program is directed by Ed Pommerening, a 29-year old graduate of the University of Idaho School of Forestry, who joined the Bunker Hill in 1974.

Pommerening's research to determine plant species best suited for the Silver Valley area also demonstrated that trees grown in containers in a greenhouse had better survival and growth rates than those grown in outdoor seedbeds and planted with bare roots while dormant.

While containerized trees offer obvious advantage, there are two drawbacks, both economic. They are very expensive to purchase, and even more expensive to grow because of the high costs of constructing and operating enough conventional glass greenhouses to produce the 200,000 trees required each year for the revegetation project.

Pommerening had heard the stories about miners successfully growing plants underground, and decided to investigate the possibilities.

He found almost all the necessary elements for plant life exist in the mine. The temperature underground is constant and the humidity is nearly 100 per cent. Further, a mine provides a disease-free environment containing no insects. The only missing element is sunlight. But, sufficient artificial light can be provided by high-intensity multi-vapor quartz lamps.

Pommerening reasoned that a greenhouse underground would save construction costs of a conventional greenhouse and also save the costs of heating in the winter and air conditioning during the hot summer months. The trees would also be available as needed without shipping costs or delays. He estimated he could produce trees underground for \$80 per thousand, compared with \$300 per thousand demanded by commercial nurseries.

Bunker Hill appropriated \$3,000 to construct a prototype greenhouse in a ventilation tunnel on number five level of the mine, 3,000 feet underground. The temperature at the site is a constant 75 degrees year around and ideal humidity.

The rather simple structure consists of a 40-foot timbered frame supporting a solid roof, a wooden floor, and two long benches

for the container racks. Eight 1,000 watt lamps hang over the benches at 10 foot intervals and provide illumination 12 hours per day to simulate the summer day length.

On September 2, 1975, Pommerening planted 4,000 containers with ponderosa, lodgepole, and austrian pine seed. Within a week, they began sprouting, and within five months have grown a healthy five inches, far surpassing the growth of seedlings planted at the same time in a conventional greenhouse on the surface.

The success of the experiment has prompted Bunker Hill to extend the greenhouse another 40 feet, increasing the growing capacity to 13,000 trees. The trees will stay in the greenhouse six months and will then be transplanted in the spring. A second crop will be planted in March and transplanted in the fall.

Ultimately, the greenhouse may be extended to a total of 510 feet, which will produce two successive crops of 100,000 trees per year for use in the revegetation project.

There has already been widespread interest in the project by timber and mining companies around the country who feel the greenhouse is not only novel and interesting, but may prove to be the most efficient and economical means yet developed for producing the millions of trees required each year for forestation and revegetation projects.

The full potential is not yet known. But what started decades ago with an orange seed is being developed today by a modern Johnny Appleseed with an idea and a goal of making a valley green again.

GREATER PROTECTION TO CONSUMERS IN BANKRUPTCY

HON. MILICENT FENWICK

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mrs. FENWICK. Mr. Speaker, today I am reiterating, with 15 of my colleagues, H.R. 11871, a bill to afford greater protection to consumers in bankruptcy proceedings. Increasingly, retailers and service establishments tend to accept partial or full payment from customers, and then file a petition in bankruptcy before delivering the goods and services promised. When the bankruptcy proceedings are held, the consumer is far down the list of creditors and risks the chance of never seeing his money again. This is clearly an injustice to the consumer and I hope my amendment to the Bankruptcy Act will remedy it.

The current law lists five categories and the order of creditors who are to be paid off in a bankruptcy proceeding. The priorities are: Administrative fees for processing bankruptcy; wages due to employees; expenses of creditors in previous suits which have led to the bankruptcy proceedings; Federal, State, and local taxes; and debts owed under government laws and contracts. Consumers usually are listed as "general unsecured creditors." In the case of a bankruptcy, they are allowed to share equally with all other unsecured creditors what is left of the bankrupt's assets after the secured creditors and those with priority debts have received their share. In most cases, this means that consumers recover nothing.

By the time they are allowed to collect on their claims, nothing is left in the bankrupt's estate.

My bill would create a new, separate category for consumers, adding them to the priority list of creditors. In the order of priority, consumers would come after administrative costs, wage claims, and expenses of creditors in previous suits which have led to the bankruptcy proceedings.

There are an average 26,000 annual commercial bankruptcies in this country. While the majority of these cases involve small proprietorships with few if any consumer creditors, each year there are a number of bankruptcies involving major retail stores and consumer outlets. A department store is likely to produce from 500 to 5,000 unsatisfied consumer creditors, and the bankruptcy of a major consumer outlet may produce many thousands of unsatisfied consumer claimants.

In one case, Shield International, Inc., of New York City, a mail-order firm, filed for an arrangement under chapter XI of the Bankruptcy Act. It listed among its unsecured creditors 4,616 consumers who had paid in full for undelivered merchandise. These consumers were notified of the proceedings and advised to file proofs of claim in order to obtain their merchandise or recover their money. Many consumers, confused by the notice, wrote letters to the bankruptcy referee complaining about not having received their merchandise. Only a few filed proofs of claim. A few months later, the case was closed. None of the consumers received their merchandise or got their deposit back.

Legislation is urgently needed to correct the many abuses consumers experience in their dealings with businesses which accept consumer deposits and then enter bankruptcy proceedings. The Bankruptcy Act was last overhauled in 1938 by the Chandler Act. Since then, many provisions of the act have become outmoded or inadequate for present needs. Last January, H.R. 31 and 32 were introduced in the House. Both of these bills provide plans which would thoroughly revise the current Bankruptcy Act. Yet as comprehensive and as far-reaching as these plans are, they still lack a protective measure for consumer creditors.

Some have questioned the inclusion of an additional priority claim under the theory that in a bankruptcy, the bankrupt's assets should be divided as equally as possible. However, the major creditors in a bankruptcy are usually well-organized interests like banks and insurance companies, which are able to represent their own interests more than adequately. Consumers, who are most often unorganized and ignorant of their rights in bankruptcy procedure, would undoubtedly lose out to these interests if all were given a strictly "equal" opportunity to claim part of the bankrupt's assets. In addition, a consumer considering placing a deposit with a retailer has relatively little means of knowing the financial condition of the retailer and for this reason is in a far less advan-

tageous position than other general creditors to avoid committing funds to what may already be a "sinking ship."

Low-income consumers are especially vulnerable because they are most apt to make payments under an installment plan or shop in a financially marginal neighborhood store. The loss of a \$100 deposit can have a devastating effect on a low income individual.

I have made an informal survey of several State attorneys general about the need for legislation to protect the consumer creditor, with a favorable response. Officials from California, Massachusetts, Maine, Minnesota, New Jersey, and Utah cited cases where thousands of consumer creditors were unable to collect under bankruptcy proceedings. State officials from Alaska, Arizona, Hawaii, Maryland, New York, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Vermont, and Wisconsin wrote in strong support of a new priority to protect consumers.

As director of New Jersey's Division of Consumer Affairs, I became aware of many cases of straight fraud—deposits accepted and no orders placed for months before the bankruptcy was filed—which left innocent consumers with no recourse. Without a clearly established priority, businesses will surely establish claims before consumers can move and the race will indeed be won by those who are better equipped and more able to win.

POST ROADS GIRL SCOUTS HELP TO SAVE ST. PAUL'S CHURCH

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, last week was National Girl Scout Week and Girl Scouts everywhere celebrated their 64th anniversary. To the Post Roads Girl Scout Council of Westchester County, N.Y., the anniversary highlighted the local organization's special commitment to the preservation of a landmark which represents the beginnings of our American freedom of the press and the Bill of Rights—St. Paul's Church of Mount Vernon, N.Y.

This national shrine to the Bill of Rights was the site of the events leading up to the celebrated trial of John Peter Zenger which was responsible for the later incorporation of our free press guarantees in the U.S. Constitution. I, along with Senator JAVITS, have introduced legislation calling for the National Park Service to permanently maintain and administer this national historic site. The Post Roads Girl Scouts have been an invaluable help in rallying public support for this measure.

The Post Roads Council has recognized a need to act as an advocate for future generations of youth and to work to preserve this symbol of our American freedom. Beginning in 1971, Post Roads Girl Scouts began an outstanding Bicentennial project—a restoration project in the

cemetery to help uncover overgrown gravestones, record their fading inscriptions and mark their locations on a map to confirm, correct or complete existing records.

Under the direction of Mrs. Eugene Moskowitz, then president of the Society for the National Shrine of the Bill of Rights and now a council board member, Mrs. Arthur Willis, then an executive staff member and now retired, and Mrs. John McNamara, project coordinator, hundreds of Girl Scouts representing several communities volunteered to help. These girls were witness to the further deterioration of this nationally significant site. The 4-year project, combining educational experience for girls with a service project for a revered and imperiled national landmark, has grown into a commitment by the adults of the council to help save the landmark for future generations.

Under the leadership of council president Ms. Herbert T. Kerr of Ardsley-on-Hudson, N.Y., executive director Ms. Edward T. Blauth, and Ms. Carmen Corbin, publicity director, the council mounted a campaign to arouse the interest of Girl Scouts everywhere and to solicit their aid in demonstrating the Girl Scout concern for this national treasure. As a result, the newly elected president of the Girl Scouts of America, Dr. Gloria D. Scott has lent her support to the project.

The council has been commended for their project in St. Paul's cemetery by the National Trust for Historic Preservation, the Ann Hutchinson and Knapp Chapters of the New York State chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, American Girl magazine, and Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. I, too, wish to commend the Post Roads Girl Scouts for their fantastic efforts on behalf of this cherished shrine.

LT. GUS RETHWISCH RETIRES FROM TORRANCE POLICE DEPARTMENT

HON. GLENN M. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, April 2, members and friends of the Torrance Police Department will gather together to give a fond send-off to an old and trusted comrade. After 26 years on the force, Lt. Gus Rethwisch is retiring from police work.

"Gus," as he is affectionately known to his many friends on the force and on the golf courses of our area, was born in New Jersey 59 years ago. After serving in the U.S. Infantry during World War II, Lieutenant Rethwisch joined the Torrance Police Department in 1949. He graduated from El Camino College in Torrance, and attended California State University at Long Beach, majoring in criminology.

Lieutenant Rethwisch has returned to El Camino as an instructor of law enforcement and police science, sharing his many years of experience with young

students considering law enforcement as a career.

During his long career with the Torrance Police, Gus was promoted to sergeant in 1957 and to lieutenant only 2 years later, in 1959. He saw tours of duty on the patrol, traffic, juvenile, records and identification, services, and planning divisions, and also served as a court liaison officer.

Besides his interest in golf, Gus is an avid fisherman, and an ardent fan of the theatre. He is a member of the Torrance Police Officers Golf Association, the Los Angeles County Peace Officers Association, Torrance Elks Lodge No. 1948, Masonic Lodge No. 447, El Toga Shrine and Al Malaikah Shrine.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Torrance have long been fortunate to be served by an outstanding police force. With personnel as outstanding as Lt. Gus Rethwisch, the force has combined effectiveness as a law enforcement organization with consistently friendly relations with the community at large.

When his retirement dinner is held on April 2, the many friends Gus has made over the years will have an opportunity to congratulate him on a successful career. And the people of the Torrance community will have a chance to thank him for his many years of service on their behalf. My wife, Lee, and I join in this acknowledgement of Gus' achievements and service.

Undoubtedly, Lieutenant Rethwisch will be able to fully enjoy his many activities and interests after he hangs up the badge. I also understand that he plans to do some extensive traveling with his lovely wife, Ruby, and their son, Larry. His family and friends must be very proud of the recognition being given Gus as he retires.

HOW TO HALT EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT REGULATION

HON. MARTIN A. RUSSO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. RUSSO. Mr. Speaker, one of the most consistent complaints received from businessmen in my district is one aimed at the extensive regulatory arm of the Federal Government. Government forms, environmental impact statements, and all sorts of regulatory requirements have served to harass, perhaps unduly, the legitimate enterprises of our most industrious citizens.

The issue of Government regulation, like all issues we face in the national legislature, is a most complex issue. The public interest is best served when the governed and the Government fully understand the important economic, social, and political implications of government regulatory policy. Only through effective communication among government, the business community, and the American people can our democracy function in a truly effective manner.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article that appeared in "Nation's Business" written by

the distinguished chairman of the board of Pepsi-Cola, Mr. Donald Kendall, is a most objective and thoughtful treatment on the problem of excessive Government regulation. At this point I would like to insert this article in the RECORD and I recommend it to my colleagues:

HOW TO HALT EXCESSIVE GOVERNMENT REGULATION

(By Donald M. Kendall)

Government regulation of business is accelerating. Government is not only involving itself more and more in the affairs of business, but in entirely new directions.

This is a legitimate concern of every thinking businessman and businesswoman in the country. Therefore, the sooner we make our own realistic appraisal of government's larger presence in business, the sooner we will be able to adjust our thinking and to cope with it.

We will, of course, always have government regulation; there is no escaping that fact. But we need to know how to live with regulation and to hold it in check.

To begin with, there are today at least three ways in which government's attitude toward business is undergoing a drastic change and bringing about increasing control.

FIRST CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

The first change in the attitude of government has to do with the consumer. Government is redefining the responsibility of business for the protection of the consumer and is assuming obligation for the enforcement of that responsibility. Here are some of the things which government has done in recent years, or is projecting, relating to the consumer:

An Office of Consumer Affairs has been established, headed by a special assistant to the President.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission has been legislated into being and is operating in Washington.

Other government agencies, at the behest of the President or Congress—or on their own initiative—are expanding their consumer programs affecting business. The Food and Drug Administration and the Federal Trade Commission have both broadened their activities, for example, with the latter projecting an extensive new program to regulate advertising.

In a word, the doctrine of caveat emptor is just about dead. It is now the maker and the seller who must beware, and not the buyer.

SECOND CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

The second change in the attitude of government toward business has to do with the environment. Government is redefining the responsibility of business for the protection of the social and physical environment and is assuming obligation for the enforcement of that responsibility.

For example, Environmental Protection Agency activities are expanding, especially in regard to the automotive industry, the pulp and paper industry, and packaging. Emission controls for automobiles and proposals for a ban on nonreturnable containers are two examples of such extended activity.

THIRD CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

The third change in the attitude of government toward business has to do with the structure of business, from entire industries to individual firms. Government seems to be seeking every opportunity to regulate every phase of business.

Here are some examples of what government has done recently, or is now projecting, pertaining to the structure of business. In one sense, this type of government control is as old as the Sherman Antitrust Act, updated and extended by the creation of the Federal

Trade Commission; in another sense, it breaks entirely new ground.

For example:

Stepped-up antitrust activity by the Justice Department, as exemplified by government suits against International Business Machines Corp. and the American Telephone and Telegraph Co.

Orders by the Federal Trade Commission that companies be required to report publicly on sales and earnings by each product line.

Pending legislation to break up companies in such so-called concentrated industries as oil, steel, and automobiles.

Legislation enacted a few months ago giving the President new powers to control the flow of energy supplies, continuing price controls on domestic oil, setting fuel efficiency standards for automobiles, and authorizing government checkups on information given federal agencies by energy producers and distributors.

Proposed legislation for the federal chartering of corporations, including specific requirements for government-appointed board members with access to all company data who would have the option to publish the information.

CONSEQUENCES OF DELAY

Whether or not the items listed here are still in the debating stage, they illustrate an established trend of accelerated government intervention in business. Given the favorable attitude toward this trend generally ascribed to the 94th Congress, the situation must be taken seriously by top business management—which means that to delay doing something about it could prove disastrous for the American incentive system and for the American people.

Paradoxically, by what business has done, as well as by what it has not done, business has added fuel to the acceleration of government control.

For one thing, business has encouraged government involvement in business affairs by seeking special help from government in certain situations. The problem here is a complex one, and businessmen have not always been to blame.

It is a fact of life that government can grant favors and that its ability to do so is a function of its power. With hundreds of billions of dollars to spend on goods and services, government is a particularly good customer of business.

So long as the meeting between the two takes place in the open market, no harm is done. But when businessmen seek special legislative treatment as suppliers to government, business tends to make itself dependent on government and, to that extent, impairs the market system.

UNREASONED ANTI-PATHY

A second way in which businessmen abet the spread of government involvement in business is by unreasoned antipathy toward government. By failing to appreciate the essential functions of government appropriate to a democratic society, some businessmen—too many, in fact—disqualify themselves as relevant voices in public debate.

Clearly, good government is vital to our society in carrying out effectively the duties and responsibilities assigned to government by the Constitution and the law of the land. When businessmen fail to affirm the need for good government and refer to government as evil per se, they lose both credibility and influence.

Although political democracy and an economic system based in private enterprise are in many ways interdependent—and always will be—there is, by the very nature of things, a built-in tension between them. The interests of business and other social institutions, government included, do not always appear identical. They often must be

reconciled through negotiation and trade-off.

FAILURE TO COMMUNICATE

Business, therefore, does itself no good by dismissing the claims of government or of any other social institution. If the claims have merit—as some of those of consumers and ecologists, for instance, have proved to have—they will be met in spite of the aloofness of business and without the socially constructive help which business is so well-equipped to contribute.

A third way in which business paradoxically encourages increased government regulation is by failing to communicate clearly and convincingly to its many constituents—customers, employees, stockholders—and by failing to get its story across to the media.

The fault is not always the fault of business. For a number of reasons, the media often distort the business picture. Scandals involving a handful of shady operators make the headlines, for example, while the daily constructive and ethical activities of reputable businessmen—that is, the vast majority—go unnoticed.

Thus, the judgment of the general public tends to be formed on the basis of sporadic aberrations, rather than on the sustained performance of the private business system.

The result—both of ineffective communication by business and unbalanced reporting about business—has been and is a pervasive popular antipathy toward business, which reflects itself in the election of many anti-business public officials and the passage of much of the antibusiness legislation which we see today.

Still, it is too easy to point the finger at the media and to feel sorry for ourselves. The truth is that, if the story of business is not being accurately and adequately told, it is the fault of business. The blame can be put on no one else.

Business management, therefore, must communicate, not only to the media, but to everyone concerned. This is the reality we must face up to. And the art of communication, as we employ it, must include both knowing exactly how to communicate and specifically what to communicate.

DUAL RESPONSIBILITY

In other words, the business executive's overall responsibility for the business climate is a dual obligation both to inform and to be informed by public opinion. The problems of business in dealing with government are relatively simple. Regulation becomes a problem only when enough public support has been mustered to legislate it.

The real challenge to management is to win enough public support to head off government action which is likely to be harmful to business and which is without social merit.

Effective action of this kind on the part of business is possible. This has been demonstrated in at least two recent and important cases.

1. When the Justice Department announced its suit against the American Telephone and Telegraph Co., the larger part of the national press—not generally probusiness—was opposed to the government's action.

2. Elements of the 1974 Trade Reform Act favoring free international trade can be traced to the active involvement of businessmen working together through the Emergency Committee for American Trade.

In one case, a private company, and in the other, an association of private businessmen, worked methodically and unrelentingly to solve a problem. The problem in both cases, as businessmen saw it, was that the proposed public policy would injure both private and public interests. In both cases, businessmen assembled the facts to support their positions and communicated them with skill and diligence to the public at large and to in-

terested groups, both in and outside government.

AT&T was able to demonstrate that breaking it up would only result in higher prices and poorer service to the public. The Emergency Committee for American Trade showed that certain kinds of restrictive international trade policies were detrimental to both the United States and the international economy.

COME OUT OF HIDING

The issues involved in both instances have, of course, not been resolved, but then, in a free dynamic society, issues rarely are. However, these examples do suggest a number of guidelines for management in dealing with public issues affecting the business climate.

Business managers must come out of hiding on social questions affecting their companies and industries, and they must pay a more active, forthright role in public debate. There is a powerful tendency among businessmen faced with criticism to call out the technical troops—lawyers, scientists, public relations people, among them—and to retire to the familiar and comfortable worlds of finance, marketing, administration, and so on.

Needless to say, management in this complex world needs all the technical assistance it can get, but technicians are only as effective as the leadership they work under. Ultimate responsibility for dealing with the world in which the company operates rests with top management, and this responsibility cannot be delegated.

Not only is it top management's job, but in the light of mounting criticism of business and the growing trend for this criticism to be translated into government action, it is a top-priority job and an urgent one.

To deal effectively with criticism, management must be sure of its own position. It is vital to listen, actively and creatively, and to evaluate criticism on its own merits.

Is the criticism bigness? Well, what does bigness mean? What is the optimal size of a business organization, for what purpose, and from whose point of view? What are the alternative methods of industrial organization, and what are their social and political implications? What would the results of such industrial reorganization be in terms of costs, distribution, prices to the consumer?

HOW CLEAN IS CLEAN?

Is the charge pollution of the environment? Well, what are the facts? How clean is a clean environment, and how much is society willing to pay for what level of cleanliness? At what point are we willing to trade off ecological for economic factors?

Is the question one of excess profits? Well, when are profits excessive? What is the relation between profit on one hand and supply and demand on the other? Between profit and capital accumulation to finance commerce and industry? Between profit and willingness to assume risk in order that the goods and services society wants and needs get produced and distributed—and that the all-important jobs be created?

QUESTION OF ETHICS?

Is the charge that businessmen are unethical? What are the facts? Which particular businessman in what specific circumstance? What is the difference between illegal and unethical activities? By what system of values is an act judged unethical?

Is the charge that merchandise is shoddy or dangerous or that service is poor? What is the responsibility of the maker and seller, on one hand, and of the buyer and user on the other? What recourse does a competitive market provide the consumer?

Is the charge that advertising and packaging mislead the consumer? Are people buying too much of what is bad for them and

too little of what is good for them? Well, what is the presumed level of competence of an adult citizen in our society? And who is making the presumption? Moreover, if the popular level of taste or judgment is deemed too low, then who shall have the responsibility for raising it? And will that power be enforceable by government? And how will it be policed?

REAL AND RELEVANT

In the contemporary business climate, in the current social debate, these are all real and relevant questions—and there are many more. They are difficult questions, and they will not go away. Managers must ask these questions of themselves before they confront the critics of business with them.

Moreover, the answers cannot be routine or mechanical because the issues go to the heart of the free-market system. They must be founded in conviction about the kind of society we want, and they must be well-documented.

However, knowing where he stands on social and political issues as they relate to business is only half of the business manager's job. The other half of his job—the important half at the present time—is to communicate.

He must communicate and keep on communicating until he gets the truth across—until he makes his voice heard and his influence felt.

The newspaper editorial and the TV news-cip have a direct bearing on what happens in the polling booth. Legislation tends to follow hard upon photographs of geese dying in oil slicks, automobile accidents, or women with baby carriages marching in protest.

Against a backdrop of such high emotion-alism, it is admittedly not always easy to communicate coolly, clearly, and wisely. But it is essential for the economic well-being of the country that businessmen not be singled out as the villains in these daily dramas and that businessmen not react defensively.

If industrialization creates ecological and social problems, responsibility for solving them rests with everyone who participates in them—which is everyone.

The businessman is a citizen, a family man, a sharer of social values like everyone else.

HIGH RESPONSIBILITY

He should be prepared to present himself as such, to argue each case on its merits, and, if he believes in it, to argue the merits of the free-market system with skill and imagination. He should see this as a high-priority responsibility and take every opportunity to accept this responsibility individually as a representative of his business or in association with others.

If the media are, as many businessmen believe unsympathetic toward business or poorly informed about it, that is no reason to hide from the media.

It is all the more reason to regard media relations as a tough management problem that must be solved. But it is by no means an impossible problem.

GET BUSY AND DO IT

The way to solve this problem is to get busy and do it. Business surely has all the resources and organization needed to communicate adequately and effectively to the media and to all individuals concerned.

Similarly, in government relations, communications can be vastly improved between businessmen and government officials by making use of every opportunity for formal and informal contact. It is surely worth the effort.

Government regulation will always be with us. But there is no sense in letting the present trend continue, allowing government regulation to get out of hand, when, by waking up to the situation and putting forth the required effort, we can live with regulation and hold it in check.

SOLVING THE MEANS TEST PROBLEM NOW

HON. H. JOHN HEINZ III

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. HEINZ. Mr. Speaker, the swift passage of H.R. 12455 which calls for delay of individual means testing for some groups until October 1 of this year—shows that when Congress wishes to move with alacrity, it can. I support this measure, but only as a step to forestall the impending disaster of having to implement this measure on April 1. Congress should now act with equal speed to prohibit individual means testing for the elderly, blind, and disabled, a measure which an overwhelming majority of individual constituents and citizen groups nationwide support.

H.R. 12455 which calls for an extension from April 1 to October 1, 1976 of the maximum period during when recipients of services under title IV-A and VI of the Social Security Act may continue to receive services under title XX of that act without individual determinations, does not solve the problem of eligibility determination of the elderly, blind, and disabled. It merely puts off until a time when it is unlikely that Congress and the administration will be able to act on it effectively—the time of our national elections.

The question is—what reason do we have to delay this issue until after the elections. All sides have been heard. An impressive array of testimony and evidence has been marshalled which supports the contention made by senior citizens, blind, disabled, and other groups that the individual eligibility determination procedure is degrading, wasteful, and ineffective in targeting title XX moneys to these groups who need them most.

There are many groups who have already had to give individual means testing. Continuation of group eligibility—really area eligibility for group services—under H.R. 12455 depends on prior designation of a geographic area as imposed or as a poverty target area. But in many rural areas, and for persons and groups of persons who may have individual incomes below State title XX eligibility levels who live outside of these title IV-A and VI areas, this “grandfathered group” eligibility does not apply. They must take the means test now.

The individual means test under title XX is thus already inequitably applied, and has been demonstrated to be unworkable both in terms of administrative feasibility and senior citizen acceptance. H.R. 12455 is needed as a measure to forestall the immediate implementation of that procedure—but it should not be left to stand alone until October 1 which, practically speaking, means until after the elections. I believe that Congress must settle the question now by voting any suitable measure, for example, H.R. 8922, that would eliminate individual means testing for those categories of individual and services which have been shown to merit such exemption on both

humane and economic grounds—the elderly, the blind, and the disabled. These groups clearly have inordinate difficulty in complying with individual means tests. They are less able to provide for their own needs on their own initiative without some form of assistance in the form of social services, and unlike children, do not have a societally designated caretaker or parent.

We should not delay any longer. We have within our power the capability to remove this grim barrier to help for those groups. We should finish the job that H.R. 12455 addresses itself to before the next congressional recess.

SUGAR AND SUPPLY AND DEMAND

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the free market is working. Sugar prices are balancing at a reasonable price. In fact, consumption is increasing because of moderate prices. That must be taken as good news by the sugar industry. Under the old Sugar Act, the price objective for January 1976 would have been \$13.71 per hundredweight. The current domestic spot price is \$15.50 according to Richard E. Bell, Assistant Secretary for International Affairs and Commodity Programs, USDA. At the same time, the market has worked to provide lower prices to the consumer for sugar in 5-pound bags and in processed foods.

Contrary to the doom predicted by the sugar lobby, the sugar industry and the consumer both have benefited from the change in the law.

Mr. Bell's comments also address the timely subject of sugar substitutes. Artificially high prices do encourage substitute products. The competition from lower-cost high-fructose corn syrup should be a warning to the proponents of a new sugar act. Higher prices and restrictive production will hasten the demise of the sugar industry. The free market is the sugar industry's friend, even if it does not treat the sugar lobby as sweetly.

Text of Assistant Secretary Bell's remarks follows:

THE OPEN SUGAR POLICY: ONE YEAR'S EXPERIENCE

(By Richard E. Bell)

Last year, for the first time in 40 years, the United States had an open-market policy for the production and marketing of sugar.

Expiration of the U.S. Sugar Act on December 31, 1974 removed quotas on domestic cane and beet supplies. The decision in 1973 not to continue economic provisions of the International Sugar Agreement and expiration of the Commonwealth Sugar Agreement in 1974, placed trade of world sugar on a much freer basis. The only limitations for U.S. sugar imports in 1975 were a nonrestrictive 7-million ton global quota and a tariff of .625 cents per pound. The same provisions apply this year.

At the beginning of 1975 there was anxiety in some quarters of government and industry about possible effects of an open-market policy on U.S. sugar production and trade.

Domestic sugar prices had reached \$64.50 per cwt. on November 20, 1974, and sugar prices in the world market also were at a record high. There was concern about increased beet acreage and about prospects for increases in both cane and beet sugar production. There was apprehension about reduced returns and consumer resistance to high sugar prices.

But, in fact, 1975 turned out to be a relatively good year for the U.S. sugar industry. Prospects for increased production did prove to be correct. The 1975/76 sugar crop is now estimated at 82.3 million metric tons on a raw value basis—a record output and some 4 million tons above production in 1974/75. Prices, in recent months, have remained between 14 and 16 cents per pound in contrast to unprecedented highs in 1974. And consumption is on the rise following the decline in price. Price is balancing supply and demand.

Increased world sugar production in 1975/76 is primarily the result of expanded beet plantings, particularly in Europe and the United States. But also contributing is slightly higher cane production.

U.S. beet sugar production is expected to total 750,000 metric tons more than a year earlier, while cane sugar will be up about 300,000 metric tons. Output in Europe is expected to be about 2 million tons higher. Expanded acreages, both here and in Europe, were encouraged by the higher prices prevailing early in the season.

World stocks at the end of the 1975/76 crop year are estimated to total about 15 million metric tons. If estimates are correct, world stocks as a percent of world consumption will have declined over a 10-year period from around 35 percent in 1966/67 to less than 19 percent in 1975/76. If stocks remain at the current relatively tight level, there will be no real threat of a depression in sugar prices.

One of the most significant effects of the U.S. open-market sugar policy is the changing pattern of U.S. sugar imports. In 1975, U.S. raw sugar imports totaled 3.3 million metric tons—a decrease of more than one-third from the previous year. At the same time, refined sugar imports increased from about 200 tons to 150,000 tons.

During 1975, imports of sugar into the United States were considerably reduced from such traditional suppliers as Brazil, Mexico, the Philippines and Venezuela as compared with a year earlier. On the other hand, U.S. sugar imports from Australia almost doubled.

Establishment of a quota which is essentially unrestrictive, maintaining the tariff at its lowest legal rate, and failure to extend the Sugar Act all signalled a shift in U.S. policy toward a freer market for sugar. These all were actions consistent with policies being pursued for other U.S. food and fiber commodities.

For the past several years we have been pursuing an international commodity in agriculture based on the same principles as our domestic agricultural policy. We have been urging market orientation. We have been urging the removal of production and import restraints on agricultural products. We have been urging removal of restraints which limit consumption. We have been urging adoption of policies which stimulate food production in chronically food-deficit countries.

At present, our efforts are concentrated in the Multilateral Trade Negotiations taking place in Geneva under the auspices of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). But we are also pursuing these same objectives in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in Paris as well as at the International Wheat Council (IWC) in London and in ongoing bilateral discussions with our international trading partners.

It would be these same principles that would guide our participation in any renegotiation of the International Sugar Agree-

ment. The United States is not a signatory to the present International Sugar Agreement. Meetings to renegotiate the International Sugar Agreement are scheduled to take place in Geneva from September 13 to October 15, 1976. The United States plans to participate in those meetings.

International commodity agreements of the traditional type, such as the International Sugar Agreement, and restrictive domestic legislation, such as the U.S. Sugar Act, are clearly not consistent with the aims of our present national agricultural policy. We are not interested in outdated concepts where price ranges are set and supplies and markets allocated among participants. We do, however, see some merit in international agreements which facilitate the exchange of market information and provide mechanisms for international consultations on short-term commodity problems.

Without traditional institutional arrangements of the International Sugar Agreement, some people thought the world price of sugar would fluctuate wildly. Without the U.S. Sugar Act, some suppliers felt the differential between the price objective under the Sugar Act and world prices would widen substantially. Neither has proved true. Prices have declined gradually. They have not fluctuated unduly. Under the old Sugar Act, the price objective for January 1976 would be \$13.71 per cwt. The current domestic spot price is \$15.60.

Perhaps the greatest problem created by protectionist measures for sugar—as well as for almost any other commodity—is invitation for substitutes when the price level is too high. This has happened to sugar. Primarily because of favorable prices, corn sweeteners have gradually made great inroads into the U.S. industrial sweetener market.

The dramatic sugar price increases in 1974 stimulated a substantial increase in facilities to produce the relatively lower-cost high-fructose corn syrup (HFCS). Even greater inroads into the demand for sugar in the United States can be expected as these plants begin production in the late 1970's.

Corn sweeteners may now have a long-run comparative advantage over sucrose (sugar) in many food processing applications in the United States. The implications for sugar suppliers—domestic and foreign—are clear. Unless sugar remains competitive in price, HFCS will at a minimum take market growth from sugar. U.S. sugar consumption, therefore, could remain relatively static over the next few years. U.S. cotton and dairy industries have had similar experiences with substitutes.

Trading commodities in a relatively free and open market tends to discourage introduction of substitutes. Broadening of the world sugar market permits countries to view the market in the context of a competitive market, rather than a residual market. This should lead to a market that will be more responsive to longer term supply and demand factors rather than short term supply fluctuations.

When restrictions are placed on trade of agricultural products through mechanisms such as international commodity agreements, the opportunities for government intervention are increased. Usually, several government agencies are involved in negotiations and the additional and diverse views tend to complicate trade procedures. Effects other than economic can become determinant—i.e., political or foreign policy considerations may become dominant. Trade based on comparative advantage offers the best hope for U.S. agriculture.

Some studies already completed indicate that there will be a world gain from free trade in sugar. Countries with a comparative advantage in production will produce more, and consumers will receive sugar under more favorable terms.

TRITON COLLEGE SPONSORS "ALL NATIONS POETRY CONTEST"

HON. HENRY J. HYDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. HYDE. Mr. Speaker, believing that its educational function should not be limited by community, State, and national boundaries, Triton College, of River Grove, Ill., has decided to offer the lovers of poetry throughout the world an opportunity to enter its "All Nations Poetry Contest." With the help of the U.S. Information Agency, announcements of this program have been distributed to all parts of the world. In the three years that the program has existed, thousands of poets have taken the time to enter this program, and have come to know of the concern of Triton College with world unity and human accord. Triton College, as demonstrated by the programs that emanate from its curriculum, is a place where sensitivity exists and people can meet and have a dialog as individuals, not as representatives of a nation, political party, or any specific ideology.

Mr. Speaker, I include a selection of the poems from the All Nations Poetry Contest to be printed in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. The poems selected are from the first volume of Passage, edited by Malcolm D. Berd and Robert F. Hlavin, and printed by the Triton College Press. "Passage" was compiled from the poetry judged as best submitted to the first All Nations Poetry Contest. "Passage" itself has been accepted for inclusion in the Library of Congress, and represents the first volume in a series of volumes of poetry to be published by the Triton College Press, as a culminating activity to their international poetry contest, and as further evidence of their desire to work for greater human harmony. The world of poetry is benefited by the presence of "Passage," and the poets of the world have another outlet for their self-expression—a deep need that cannot help but be in the best interest of us all.

PASSAGE TO NATURE

POEM

(By Rudy Shackelford, Gloucester, Va.)

Last light edging inland
The river blind
Among rushes finding its way
By touch
The brooding mountain folding about rocks
Its wings of clouds
Myriad silence of stars
The deep quiet of many eyes locked in sleep
I am the runner with the torch that was the sun
The grave of my shadow receives me.

NATURAL CALENDAR OF EVENTS

(By Dennis D. Roach, South Lake Tahoe, Calif.)

Suppose Nature became the new government
And the ocean washed the sewage back into the suburbs

Suppose game-birds wore bullet-proof vests
And the rivers disassembled all the dams

Suppose fresh air smothered the smog
And freeways freely returned to soil

Suppose god is an American Indian
And tomorrow is Judgment Day.

ESSENCES

(By David Stuart Ryan, Surrey, England)

The estuary of the sea has filled, now it empties.
Why do grey blistering clouds smother a weaning new moon?

The pale crescent blows swirling in vapour above curfew trees.
This is still evening's hour, it is announced the joy will be soon.

Watery promises of the sky fill sea waters
The middle is set solid, a dark mound of wet earth.

Below bubbles waters containing changing moods, an altar.
The waters cannot speak they feel, cannot affect a swan's worth.

On mud flats the heavenly swan waddles, its soft prints
Are left, but majestic the swan returns with the ingress

Of the sea, now floats white in blue crystals under moonlight glints.
The white faced sea batters old rocks by the castle's ruins, progress

Of the breath of all, contained in sea surging, presences
Of night's unuttered knowledge, grey upright stones were left

On middle England's plains, old man guardians of messages
From the Milky Way's beyond parts, for doubting men to accept

As time's hints of sublimity at the end, such dwells
Deep within, announce the trillion stars glistening freshness

On the hollow earth, ravished the earth was, cleared of summer's swells,
Gauged out flooding colour flowers, rich sweet leaves, those excrescences.

To purge is to sweep away all the loose stuff in life
Till returns the underlying harmony of strength.

In so old stones, so old so old, is rough strength, the hues grow rife
On the return of the Spring waters, for time is the waters' length.

RECOVERED

(By Barbara V. Mark, Lombard, Ill.)

Months of a green-lawned summer
I knotted daisies, plentiful
Chains of pecking orders
To crush viciously in my hands

Until I found
Myself less than a flower,
Estimator of their strengths,
Counter of their dead bodies.

In a heap they lay
Broken, juice-blackened stems,
Rusting petals—

On my palms quiet evidence
Stayed, deliberate
Delicate particles
Of impermeable gold

Keeping me
To free me
To other seasons.

SUMMER SNOW

(By Elizabeth Kempf, Fanas, Switzerland)

It is in the Summer that I come warm.
Roll me in the grass on a hot afternoon
And chase me to the cool stream.

Let's plunge together running up the river
And climb past the mottled lava
Where the rock is hard.

Oh stand with me again inside the waterfall!
The mountain roars overhead
Spraying our bodies hell cold as it lunges
Into the stone smooth crevice.

Die with me in ice until the night falls down.

Then

Carry me home to light a fire
Inside my breasts
Making a home beside my hearth.

And when you discover
My thighs are charred logs, smouldering
Think of how they glowed
When you stoked the hot coals
And remember the snow.

It melts on the mountain.

BACKPACKING

(By Jana Harris, Berkeley, Calif.)

Summer has brought me a dry heat?
The rotten wood snaps—a thousand Chinese
puzzle pieces unhinge.

In these canyons the wasps and children sing,
while bees wrapped in black rat fur
swarm on my legs;

There is something here that they want, their
abdomens pant after it—They hear no
excuses.

For comfort I run to the Columbine Tiger-
lilies, the rat-foot leaf of the Bleeding
Heart;

But they do not speak while I sit among
them.

For revenge I pick the scabs of trees, such
the crusts of dry sap.

Dead branches strike back like snakes.
Somewhere, among these Ming landscapes, is
the soft fur of elk antlers;

My fingers wear the edges smooth, the stones
are white from urine.

Late afternoon brings me the knife nosed
mosquito;

The drill, drill, drill of the bit and the brace.
These sunsets have burnt my high peaked
cheek bones.

The trees are screaming:
My teeth melt to sand.

What I want now are the soft rocks to mother
me.

I would lay in them like lakes of milk.

PASSAGE TO SPACE

THE LONG RELEASE

(For my father)

(By Michael Dow, Penngrove, Calif.)

In my sleep you called to me last night.
You had been awakened by your death.
Like all travellers you needed someone to
see you off.

II

A child huddled in sleeping bag
I watched you disappear, hunting into the
night.

Leaving me wondering: will I see you again?

III

You sit on the edge of your bed in the yellow
light.

Bony knees clasped by bonier hands.
For years your breath has kept you from
wandering.

You won't need breath for this journey.
Still you gulp air like a swimmer preparing
to dive.

IV

As you watch me hovering here your eyes
appear to grow small with effort, fear;

They seem to adjust to a change of scene
and light.

V

You reach to me your birdlike hand,
A blue shoot struggling from a dead stem.

Visions flicker in the wash of my eyes—
Marsh leaf-mold blooming into bird bursting
into flight.

VI

When I see you clearly, I reach to steady
your ribs,

Feel the heat rising through you into your
sweating head

As your breath heaves like an animal giving
birth, I feel, see
You leaving your body.

VII

And I awake in the dark
Alone with my life on this mountain I farm.
On the summit a shadow floats in a pool of
light.

Flickers, then quickly, as if pulling itself
out of the earth

The moon appears bearing in upraised arms
the ghost of its self.

PASSAGE TO SPACE

(By Pedro Bandeira Freire, Lisbon, Portugal)

Living outside the self the risk
of wanting to say the impossible
brethren with death.

Dreaming of communicating silence
where words become clear
sought in the strangulation
that knots the flesh

Going as far as emptiness
can take us piercing screams
because to say is not yet saying
in this too grammatical universe
where words exist no more
just stickers just tickets
pronouncing it is enough
repeating it rereading it
perceive that the word is saved
from the vastness of meaning behind it

We usually just slip
slip slip slip away
into the institution of nothing
intuition of nothing
only to utter another word
the word Nothing
depending on what we hide or show
bitter attempt that only leads to
the day of the world's destruction
words to be used nothing more
than word-fragments
as the consciousness of being
is nothing more than a fragment of
conscience

Let us sing the body in its voluptuousness
its burning appetites its extravagant richness
all natural joys
let us celebrate the love of the flesh the
spirit

let us make evil become the good
let us believe the demands of "I"
to become social
cosmic the world's perfection
We will not walk toward the nothing.
We will turn to intuition
We will say it categorically:
"I know we are immortal."

BEYOND THE GREEN AND THE YELLOW
(By Thomas Daniel Rowe, Canton, Ohio)

The steep-banked watersides
Reflected emerald on cerulean
And merged with the lake isle,
Resembling a centerless disk.

No breezes rustled the oak leaves
And no winds caught the cloud-sails,
As they would if some snow-geese flocked
On their endless journey to Canada.

In this zone of perfect emptiness
I sat for six hours motionless
In some strange lethargic state.
Then inwardly roused, I leaped,
My eyes suddenly and expectantly
Following the guiding sun as it passed,
Blazing into the mystic island,
And, at last, disappearing behind.

Sliding down the steep waterside
I took to a dugout rowing
With strokes swift and silent,
To the isle disk across the lake.
Stepping out of the boat with feet
Sinking in the moss shore mud,
Six speckled missel thrushes
Darted into the fertile oaks.

Standing there I remembered
Summer morning sacrifices
When torches were pale against the sun
And altars smoked in a stone-circle;
Priests dressed themselves in bison skins—
Hoary heads of hair held by bone-pins,
Grisly tusks goring their enemies,
Horrible painted faces convulsing.

Green oaks yellow with mistletoe
Out of harmony with the season
As I was out of harmony
With the prophetic of life.
A sole profound intuition
Came, like the moody thaws of spring,
Before all things primordial—
And the autumn is not far behind.

Beyond the green and the yellow,
In some further part of the forest,
Breezes were stirring fallen leaves—
Leaves that fell in some other year,
And in this zone of divine reign,
I found myself transported away—
Riding on the cloud-sails in the skies,
Forever in the sight of God.

FREEWIND

(By Maeve Butler, Minneapolis, Minn.)

Each hour moves in sentences
of footsteps on the stairs,
red floors, or the track
of treadings off in dew.
After the years one dares
to wake and to remember
the souging of the grass blown back

the poplar leaves that signal
inversely silver destiny for rain;
their velvet April chatter
make the skirl of September:
the midnight clatter,
as the house behaves.
Who wake and who remember

later the footsteps
crunching
on the stone?
And tuneless snatches humming
from the air?
A cupboard shutting
in the farther room?

And, earlier, the sunlit lintel
and paint-locked window;
the champion sun and mullion prison,
framing the anecdotal trees . . .
in a room where morning
tips and creaks a different waking
for each person.

What landing do we cross alone
to wake and to remember moods,
or trespass from
to hear—
where grass is sadness
and a year has grown—
the partridge drumming from the woods?

ONLY THE WAREHOUSE

(By D. S. Long, Christchurch, New Zealand)

only the warehouse
knows the true sadness
of an empty box
the sense of despair
in a full one

it stands with its tapes
and twines
preparing those
who want to leave

even the damp bins
of shredded newspaper
can't help but tell the truth

its best friend
is a crowbar
its enemy
a packer's knife

and birds
trapped up among the rafters
search for nails
on which to hang their tired wings

PASSAGE TO SELF

THE BIG ROOM

(By Ron Ellis, Fort Atkinson, Wis.)

i.
It was too easy,
growing notes long and full like melons,
tumbling handfuls of trills like berries into
a pail,

harvesting morning, sun, and self
in a garden made of boards, my tree-house.

ii.
I play again, but each tone is a blade
scraping away my hanging garden.
I put the recorder down,
polished cherry on rough boards.

iii.
The clearing I've bulldozed with melodies
grows thick with old rebukes:
squawk of hairy woodpecker,
harangue of chipmunk,
hiss of leaves.

iv.
Last night we sat by the fire,
a couple trying to make a space of quiet.
We stared at embers, age-rings
pulsing chromatrics beneath a fur of ash.
Our son when rebuked sat beside us,
willing at last to stop shouting,
to give up strewing sparks and trails of smoke
with his torch of cherry wood.

Now he fidgets and mimics the hissing fire
until she touches him, her urging just right.
We watch. He says he'd like to be
small enough to walk right in—
"You'd be in a big room,
the walls all glowing colors—"

We walk with him
in our fireproof suits
gasping at the high hall,
the great flaring beams
hewn from the sun.
We look at each other;
we can only smile.

v.
I watch and hear their music blaze:
woodpecker, chipmunk, leaves.
I can feel a small kindling.
I am taught by woman and woods, son and
fire

FREYA'S CAT

(By Phyllis Janik, Hinsdale, Ill.)

When I am out of cream
you will drink my coffee black,
black as the sky this morning
we watched out the window,
awaiting the forecast snow.

Birth occurred at 10:15 and is continuing.
History will say about this time
that the pictograph for "sky"
began to mean "heaven." Meanwhile
Disaster opened his cold wings
and now covers us like the capes
of the snowy mountains.

What is standing there in the shadows
that I should feel distant rituals
of life, death, the birth
of another disaster,
through the living skeleton in my hands?

O my sister is lovelier than I;
her ankles are slim,
her dresses are delicate and thin
and all four winds move them,
and at her legs,
at her knees are gray cats with gray voices
She dines at a table of emerald
with her cats, all with fur coats
and long, slow lives.
She would not have these dogs of mine
waiting at the oven,
waiting for my dinner
or barking at the windows
upsetting the visitors and plants.

What does Freya need? she has her cats,
her colors, emerald and gray.

To charm relatives and enemies I hold this,
carved out of stone or bone:
six rings surmounted by a fish-eagle
symbolizing the fight spirit of the clan

and sign my name:

an acrobat somersaulting over a bull
DREAM OBEDIENCE IN SIX STEPS
(By Enid Shomer, Miami, Fla.)

THE DREAM

There is a dream flying in this house,
roustabouting mustache cups, fingering bells,
lifting the window sash. It wants to get out.

It wants to get in. It scuds through each bed-
room
searching a suitable host. It hovers over the
face

like a silk scarf before it parts over
the swordswallower's blade. It hovers like
a hummingbird choosing a flower.

Sometimes I wake before it leaves, into a
room
stuffy as a taxi in winter, as sad as a pricked
balloon. I can see its eyes swiveling in the
dark,
desperate for the way in, the way out.

i.
Callipers to crack a walnut, or feathered
spiderlegs.

Nutcrackers on a walnut was only taking out
the garbage.

They say it is holding on tight and fearing
a thing that may crack, or crack me.
First step in obedience: ignore the new
mythology.

Try to dream of Dionysius with his thick
musk-ox heavy blond hair or epicene
with golden Shirley Temple curls.
I try to dream him and fail.

ii.
Think of the new myths as templates, giving
shape, some cognate meaning to the
dream.

Paisley or parabolic, ellipses far-flung as fly-
ing saucers, ellipses the shape of in-
finity moving like live wires across the
dream expanse.

There is a pleasure in this stage, like watch-
ing birds make sudden aerial forma-
tions.

But shapes, finally, too distant to touch, all
the blood wrung out, lacking color.

iii.
Stitch the dream into a tapestry to warm
the walls of the mind.

It is Gothic, full of shape and color and when
sewn right behind the eyes gives some
insulation to the wearer.

It is florid and overripe, with natura natu-
rans and symbols of love and fright,
such as unicorns, lions, doves, small
percolating dogs.

Even calipered walnuts and feathery spider-
legs find a place among the pendant
flowers and threadworn smiles of
courtly lovers.

The only trouble is nothing moves.

iv.
I deflate the dream and squeeze it under my
fingernail, flick it into the corner like
a speck of dirt.

But I forget. I have not chosen it. It chose
me.

It is unhappy and cries out in the night like
a small dog at the bottom of basement
stairs.

No bone I throw allays its pain.
No place for it but snuggled close by in the
bed.

It is a pitiful small thing that needs me. It
is an irresistible lackey, like all dreams.

v.
One day I realize it is growing up from pup
to fullgrown pet, but still cries if I
closet it away.

I have grown fond of waiting for its ingot eyes to find me.
Only yesterday I remembered the smell of childhood woolens (damp flowerpot) on the first cold day of the year.
Also the taste of my uncle's purple lips in Baltimore, his voice on alternate Sundays like coffee slushing in the cup.
I almost felt the touch of the first boy's hand on my electric-fence stomach.

VI

Today the dream awoke, dressed and had breakfast as usual, then slumped into a trance, spoke in human tongues, undressed the past.
No shape or symbol or matter what they say, or myths.
How betrayal felt like feathered spiderlegs walking inside a deserted chest.
How the leap to love was a measured thing before it moved, like a calipered walnut aligned by human hands.

ON THE SUICIDE OF A RELIGIOUS FANATIC
(By Linda Ann Roach, South Lake Tahoe, Calif.)

Mother, last night I did dream of a visit to your grave;
You woman who made mystery beside my bed.
Who came swiftly in the black
After the air I sucked was no longer
A relief.
Then could I take white knuckles from my ears.
For in small comfort you would stroke
The blood of your blood.

I writhed in blankets of discomfort, praying
For censure in words
Which flew higher than birds
With flaming feathers.

Female praying on an axis of disbelief. "I am
The Way, The Truth, The Holy Nest which
has
Rejoiced at the second coming of the Holy Egg.

A virgin of love, I bring a harvest
Of fruit too pure to savor.
Spiritual ecstasy.
Crescendo of divine."

I did kneel by the green, grass plot.
You have propagated your faults, my
Heritage of forbidden emotion.
Osmosis of pain, that insanity swims like
Spangled fish in the essence of my heat.

The wine and the bread were your imaginative conception.
Your miracles were the simple lines drawn
Between blue words on maps in the Bible.

But you were a fearful proselytizer. Those
Labored secrets and I will stretch so that all
skin

Is massaged by the white roots of sharp
Blades, the sheer cover of your pale sacrifice.
Each pore of mine will taste the loam of your decay.

For if my mind can reach over rainbows, I
will
Sink belly down into your rotting womb
again.

SALAMANDER MOON

(By Juan Ricardo Cole, Evanston, Ill.)
the children greet you at the crazy house
like refugees at the barbed wire border
they jump on your shoulders like little
brothers

when you've come back from the war
but they carry the
war inside them

along with the drugs

dig tom sawyer

I brought some Ray Bradbury this week
(he has great appreciation for tennis shoes

and after all it's October)
making purple macramé herons
"hey, gimme back that!
Sucker! look what you
did to the wing!" the war
proceeds in nutshell fists
the tranquilizers never work

Jesse helped put his mother in the hospital
but with ten brothers and sisters on the
south side

here's as good a place for him . . .
been showing some hostility of course
it's not the best environment
only stutters with the social worker
his black face distorted, an african carving
and Matt's dad's got
a drinking problem
and ol' autistic Eddie
mostly sits and rocks
the D.M.Z.

Mariana sits quietly by and
Sean plays karate; the others ignore him
the "slip," the hurt, the bawling and brawling
the piling on top, the biting and smothering
mothering Joanie screams nigh.
Mariana sits quietly by
"Mariana, put down that knife,
little punta!"—"Yo te mataras,
Madre!" the radio crackles in
the new barrio. Mother, I want
to kill you.

the war sits inside of Mariana, now
something happened in secret to Sean
a terrible fear in a three-day darkness
of a pumpkin-sounding head crack young
disarranged like a hammered magnet

"look, Sean, in a magnet the . . .
and the diamond-back is primarily
found in . . ." a karate chop to
the neck, mischievously giggling
the war has no respect for science

"I—I d-din't like the other p-place
the t-teacher would hit m-me
but I wrote an' tol' my brother,
an he almost c-come and beat him up
I almost coudda

"liar, liar to the fire,
liar, liar to the fire . . .
and then the dirty verses
come, the ritual excommunication
of the victim of the war

twelve year old bodies and
ancient passions raging
within the flimsy frames
carnival mirrors revealing yourself

"man, if you need a fix
an' some rich dude's gotta
die so ya c'n get it,
what's that?" She wriggles
her hips in an arrogant shrug
the war says look at me

Mariana 'protects' you from vicious Sean
"you're going to kill him," she admonishes
and your stomach twinges in irony
yet the cuban cadences speak real concern
and a hill is taken in the war
one skirmish won in one year's time
"the bus is here!" you depart
from one bedlam through to its
slyer, maturer, outside
interface

the war has come too soon to the children
made by and making the warring world
it wages deep in you as well
yet in the fiercest moment
of the savagest encounter
dwells that profound serenity
waiting to be unleashed upon the universe

A TEMPORARY MORATORIUM ON
WHEAT SALES TO THE SOVIET
UNION

HON. WILLIAM R. COTTER

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. COTTER. Mr. Speaker, our failure in 1973 to predict the consequences of massive Soviet grain purchases was costly for the American consumer. We allowed the Russians to import more than 13 million metric tons of this vital commodity, a decision that reduced our grain reserves and contributed to a 21-percent increase in food prices over the past 2½ years.

This must not happen again. It is therefore disturbing that a similar lack of foresight seems to govern this administration's attitude toward Soviet purchases from our 1976 wheat crop, which becomes available for export in early June. But the American-Soviet grain export agreement, which is supposed to control Russian purchases from this crop, does not go into effect until October 1st, 4 months later. During this unregulated period, the only limitation on Soviet wheat imports is the physical capacity of Soviet and American port facilities.

Two unpredictable factors add to my concern. First, the Russians are facing serious crop failures in their winter wheat areas, a fact which leads some analysts to conclude they may try to buy up as much American wheat as they can legally import from this country. Second, our own winter wheat is in danger. No one knows the eventual losses in production that drought conditions will cause in the southern plains, where the winter wheat is grown.

The Department of Agriculture appears to share this concern. They recently admonished grain exporters not to ship out more than 1 million metric tons to the Soviets per month during the unregulated period from June to October. In reality, this limit is meaningless, since one million tons seems the monthly maximum of American wheat that Soviet ports can handle. The Department's apparent concern is encouraging, but even shipments up to this limit could have a significant impact on domestic wheat prices.

Therefore, I have introduced legislation that will impose a temporary moratorium on wheat sales to the Soviet Union until the President certifies to Congress that these sales will not seriously aggravate wheat prices. In any event, this moratorium will expire on October 1st, the date our export agreement with the Soviet Union goes into effect.

By early June, when the wheat harvest begins, we can make an accurate determination of domestic wheat production. If the administration certifies at this time that sales to the U.S.S.R. will not cause significant price increases, shipments to the Soviet Union will not be interrupted.

Mr. Speaker, American wheat farmers understandably support grain exports to the Soviet Union. My legislation is not intended to hurt the farmers or to deny them a legitimate market. That is why the moratorium provided in my legislation is temporary. But I feel strongly that wheat sales should be linked to consumer prices. If we discover that wheat sales will not hurt the consumer, they should proceed. It is important, however, that our food exports be governed by informed and thorough analysis, not by a cavalier attitude that subjects the American consumer to the whim of the Soviet Politburo.

The proposed legislation follows:

H.R. 12586

A bill to prohibit wheat sales to the Soviet Union until October 1, 1976, unless the President reports to the Congress, after May 31, 1976, that such sales will not cause serious domestic price increases

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, after the date of enactment of this Act, no person doing business in the United States may sell or offer to sell any wheat grown in the United States to or for the Soviet Union until October 1, 1976; except that, after May 31, 1976, the President may suspend the provisions of this Act if he determines (and so reports to the Congress) that United States domestic supplies of wheat are such that sales to or for the Soviet Union will not cause serious increases in the domestic price of wheat.

Sec. 2. Whoever knowingly violates the first section of this Act shall be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned not more than one year, or both.

GENERAL MOTORS' PROGRESS REPORT ON MEETING NEED FOR GASOLINE EFFICIENCY AND OIL CONSERVATION

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, shortly after the Congress passed the Energy Policy and Conservation Act last year, I asked the chairman of General Motors Corp., Mr. Thomas A. Murphy, to provide me with the sales trends in 1975 as they related to gasoline efficient automobiles. I also asked for a comparison of similar sales made during 1974.

At this point I include the text of both letters to be printed in the RECORD, for the benefit of my colleagues:

JANUARY 6, 1976.

Mr. THOMAS A. MURPHY,
Chairman, General Motors,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR Mr. MURPHY: In connection with an evaluation of the Energy Policy and Conservation Act which passed Congress last December and which sets forth a schedule for the development of gasoline-efficient automobiles, will you kindly advise me of the trends which have developed in your 1975 sales. For example, how many automobiles were sold in each category of designated gasoline consumption per mile? How do 1975 sales in these categories compare with 1974?

Last year, I was among those in the Con-

gress who advocated a special gasoline tax on the so-called gasoline guzzlers. It is my hope that essential goals may be met by voluntary action of the industry and the motoring public. What progress are we making in meeting the need for gasoline efficiency and oil conservation?

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. VANIK,
Member of Congress.

GENERAL MOTORS CORP.,
Detroit, Mich., March 2, 1976.

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. VANIK: I am pleased to respond to your recent letter requesting information on the progress we are making in meeting the need for gasoline efficiency and oil conservation.

Your statement that it is your "hope that essential goals may be met by voluntary action of the industry and the motoring public" is most welcome, even though mandatory standards are now required by the Energy Policy and Conservation Act.

In testimony before four Congressional committees last year, including the Ways and Means Committee, of which you are a member, General Motors pointed out that voluntary action by manufacturers to improve auto fuel economy as well as customer buying trends, had already achieved substantial results. Since the 1973 oil embargo, no other energy consuming sector has made more progress than the automobile industry in achieving improved energy efficiency. Moreover, the automobile industry was well on its way to achieving a dramatic 40% increase in average miles per gallon between the 1974 and 1980 model years. Yet, in spite of the manifest success of the voluntary fuel economy improvement program, Congress imposed on the industry mandatory standards that are so stringent as to threaten substantially adverse effects—in the 1980's—on automobile production, employment and the national economy.

With respect to your question as to the trends which have developed in our 1975 sales, the Environmental Protection Agency estimated that our 1975 sales-weighted average fuel economy improvement was 28%—from 12 mpg in 1974 to 15.4 in 1975. This improvement is expected to continue in 1976, up to 16.6 mpg. This will be a 38% total improvement over two model years.

Another way to look at this improvement is represented by the attached chart. You will notice that in 1974 only 60% of our production averaged over 12 mpg, whereas beginning in 1975 all of our cars exceeded that level. Each of the other higher mpg categories also shows a steady improvement.

The fuel economy improvements we have made during the past two years evidence our commitment to the President to meet or exceed the Administration's fuel economy improvement goals. For GM, by 1980 this means an average of at least 18.7 mpg, or a 56% improvement in the sales-weighted average fuel economy of our cars, compared to 1974.

The Energy Policy and Conservation Act of 1975, enacted in December, imposes gas-mileage standards on a production-weighted average basis, beginning at 18 mpg in 1978 and rising to 27.5 mpg by 1985. Congress must grant the necessary relief from the stringent emission standards that are now scheduled to go into effect in 1978 if the Act's 1978 gas-mileage standard is to be within reach. We are working diligently to attain the fuel economy requirement for 1978, but the existing emissions level for that year could preclude achievement of the 18 mpg.

Moreover, even at current emission standard levels, for General Motors to meet the gas-mileage requirements for post-1984, all but a small fraction of our production would

be cars no heavier than today's Vega—no matter how many Americans might want to buy larger cars.

It is hard to imagine so massive a disruption of free-market choice in the United States, but the Energy Act which would cause it is now the law of the land and, at least for General Motors, is already a factor in our future product planning.

A great many large families—and more than 20% of American families consist of five or more persons—simply will not want small four-passenger cars, no matter how many miles they can go on a gallon of gasoline.

GM's forward-product planners have attempted to forecast the shape of the auto marketplace as the Energy Act's impact begins to be felt. With many people reluctant to give up their old, full-size family car, new car sales could be reduced by as much as three million cars in 1985 alone. With large-car production sharply curtailed in order to obtain a sales mix necessary to achieve the gas-mileage requirements, a black market seems certain to develop for the fewer large cars which will be built.

The so-called "gas-guzzler" tax which Congress considered and rejected last year would have a similar negative effect on car sales and the economy. Many people who need full size cars for family or business reasons would continue to drive the cars they own rather than pay an excessively high price.

Furthermore, lower income people who normally buy second-hand cars also would be penalized since used cars prices reflect increases in new car prices.

Thank you for your interest in this important subject and giving us this opportunity to review what General Motors has been doing to develop more fuel efficient automobiles.

Sincerely,

T. A. MURPHY.

GM FUEL ECONOMY, 1974, 1975, 1976

SALES WEIGHTED AVERAGE

1974, 12.0.
1975, 15.4.
1976, 16.6.

PERCENT OF GM TOTAL SALES BY MPG GROUPS

12 MPG and over—1974, 60; 1975, 100; 1976, 100.
15 MPG and over—1974, 18; 1975, 64; 1976, 79.
18 MPG and over—1974, 18; 1975, 22; 1976, 32.
20 MPG and over—1974, 11; 1975, 11; 1976, 24.

MPG Values Based on the EPA 55/45 Composite. Excludes California Cars. 1974 and 1975 Sales are Based on History. 1976 Sales are Estimated.

BIG OIL'S ACHILLES HEEL

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 17, 1976

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues a very interesting editorial by Vic Rasheed, who is editor of the Nozzle, the official publication of the Greater Washington/Maryland Service Station Association. I believe it indicates that the major oil companies, in their attempts to further concentrate the oil industry and stifle competition, have alienated many elements within the industry. Simply put,

independent service station owners and operators, as well as wildcaters and independent refiners, have nothing to fear from divestiture. In fact, divestiture could significantly help the independent elements within the oil industry.

As the effort to break up the major oil companies picks up steam in the Congress, I think we will find big oil isolated, finding little support from independent elements within the industry.

Service station operators, after all, will lose nothing in a freer market. And, of course, consumers will gain.

I am appending the editorial for the interest of my colleagues:

FRANKLY SPEAKING . . . OIL COMPANIES
OVERTURN DIVORCEMENT LAW—NOW WANT
DEALERS TO HELP KILL DIVESTITURE

(By Vic Rasheed)

Recently Exxon, Amoco, Shell and other major oil companies have begun actively lobbying their dealers to support them against the stark nightmare of divestiture which has been thrust in their faces with new reality.

Last January 27, the oil companies' suit to declare the Maryland divorce law unconstitutional, bore fruit and the celebration is probably still in progress.

When you analyze both of these events you could easily come to my conclusion that the oil companies showed very poor judgment in challenging the divorce bill in Maryland.

Our bill only sought to bar the companies from engaging in the actual retail operation of a service station. It said nothing about divesting station properties or other holdings, as a flock of bills pending in Congress would require. It certainly stopped far short of the Senate amendment which would have split the companies up so that they could only engage in one phase of the industry—production of crude, transportation, refining of marketing. It almost blew the companies' corporate minds when it came within nine votes of passage in October. A switch of five votes would have done it.

Obviously divorce from engaging in the retail market with the bulletin pricing advantages oil companies enjoy, means a lot more to dealers than total divestiture.

Had the companies kept hands off the retail market and protected themselves by supporting our amendment to also bar jobbers, it may have been possible to bargain with us on divestiture. As of now, dealers will show no sympathy for "big brother" in his desperate struggle to cling to his crumbling empires and prevent a break-up of the oil companies that will make the historic Standard Oil breakup of 1911 look like peanuts.

Congressman Neal Smith's HB 811 would have SBA loan dealers up to \$350,000 each to buy their station properties to help divestiture.

Marketing incidentally represents only 16 percent of big oil's total investment.

The portions of big oil's fixed asset pie (using 1974 figures) are: production 44 percent (an investment of \$71 billion) refining 20 percent or \$32 billion, marketing 16 percent or \$26 billion, transportation 10 percent or \$16 billion, chemicals 7 percent or \$11 billion and other items 3 percent for \$5 billion.

Each segment of the petroleum industry is a major industry in its own right—a breakup of the five major U.S. oil companies would result in at least two dozen smaller firms.

Each of the top Democratic presidential candidates support divestiture and even FEA's No. 2 man, John Hill is quoted as saying that there will be a major change in the structure of the oil industry within the next five years. Hill's significant quote is, "forces have been unleashed here that can't be stopped." Too bad . . . Exxon had 1975 revenues of \$44.5 billion. Of the top-ten profit-makers in the U.S. six are oil companies. They also produce 21 percent of the nation's coal, 32 percent of our uranium and 20 percent of the world's petrochemicals.

Sometimes even a giant needs a friend.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Thursday, March 18, 1976

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.
The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

I am the vine, ye are the branches; he that abideth in Me and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit.—John 15: 5.

Almighty God, who art the light of the minds that know Thee, the life of the hearts that live Thee, and the strength of the souls that serve Thee, give us insight to see Thy hand leading us in all of life's endeavors. Show us how in the quest of the mind for truth and the heart for love we are one with Thee in Thy creative purposes. Lead us in the paths of goodness and truth that by the power of lofty ideals which stir our minds we may draw quiet strength from Thy unseen presence.

Reveal to us goals which are worthy of honor and which keep us in partnership with Thee in our endeavors to lead our Nation in the ways of justice, peace, and good will.

In the spirit of Him who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life, we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Without objection, the Journal stands approved.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Sparrow, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 611. An act for the relief of Southeastern University of the District of Columbia; and

S. 1545. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 with respect to peanuts.

The message also announced that the Vice President, pursuant to section 6968 (a) of title 10, United States Code, appointed Mr. INOUE, Mr. GLENN, Mr. HATFIELD, and Mr. TAFT to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Naval Academy.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 9355(a) of title 10, United States Code, appointed Mr. McGEE, Mr. GARY HART, Mr. HANSEN, and Mr. STEVENS to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Air Force Academy.

And that the Vice President, pursuant to section 4355(a) of title 10, United States Code, appointed Mr. PASTORE, Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. BELLMON, and Mr. BARTLETT to the Board of Visitors to the U.S. Military Academy.

The message also announced that Mr. TOWER be a conferee, on the part of the Senate, on the bill (S. 2498) entitled "An act to amend the Small Business Act to transfer certain disaster relief functions of the Small Business Administration to other Federal agencies, to establish a National Commission on Small Business in America, and for other purposes," vice Mr. PACKWOOD.

THE PLIGHT OF THE ABRAMOVICH FAMILY

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, all of the nations which signed the Helsinki accords, including the Soviet Union, pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries.

Today, I join with several of my colleagues who are conducting a vigil on behalf of Soviet families which remain separated.

At this time, I would like to bring to the Members' attention the situation of the Abramovich family.

Mark Abramovich was a mechanical engineer. He is now unemployed. He and his wife have a 1-year-old daughter. His parents are living in Israel. He applied for exit visas but was refused in 1973, and repeatedly since then, on the grounds of previous army service even though he was demobilized in 1971.

Currently the leading activist in Kishinev, he has constantly been in danger in his efforts to help Kishinev Jews obtain exit visas to Israel. He is the support and hope of the 50,000 Jews in Kishinev. Mark has been arrested several times and the family is constantly harassed. At all times, there are Soviet Secret Police outside his apartment.

Mark Abramovich is guilty of no crime other than trying to emigrate to Israel to be reunited with his parents.

The Congress and the American people seek justice under international law. We ask that the Soviet Government apply its own freedom of emigration law evenly, and we beseech them to put an end to the human suffering, the indignities, and the outright repression. In the name of humanity, we can ask for nothing less.

THE NEED FOR REINVESTIGATION OF THE KENNEDY ASSASSINATION

(Mr. DOWNING of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DOWNING of Virginia. Mr.